

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 9711) granting an increase of pension to Peter Jennings; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, urging severe penalties for spies and enemy agents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition and argument, protesting against the Borland eight-hour day for Government clerks; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also (by request), memorial of Missouri State committee, medical section, council of national defense, indorsing House bill 8937; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), resolutions of the Socialist Party, Local Queens, requesting the President and the Congress of the United States to take action to bring about an armistice among the warring nations on the basis outlined by the de facto revolutionary Government of Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), resolution of the Pittsburgh Hungarian Club, expressing sincere loyalty to the Government of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), resolution of the Thomas J. Clarke Branch, Friends of Irish Freedom, asking Congress to go on record as favoring the political independence in the form of the Irish Republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAREW: Resolution of the Association of Lithuanian Patriots of America, urging the recognition of a free and independent Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, urging more stringent legislation against spies and enemy plotters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania: Petition of Dr. N. C. Campbell, E. L. Hanson, C. G. Brevillier, F. L. Camp, and 25 others, praying for the passage of House bill 7995, for the preservation of the *Niagara*, Commodore Perry's flagship in the Battle of Lake Erie; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CURRY of California: Petition of several city officers, well-known citizens, and other residents of Stockton, Cal., in favor of increased salaries of Government employees whose classification is that of watchmen and laborers in United States post-office buildings; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of several residents of Stockton, Cal., in favor of the alien slacker bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, urging more stringent laws for the punishment of spies and enemy plotters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Brooklyn Free Kindergarten Society, urging the creation of a kindergarten division in the Bureau of Education; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. FOSTER: Resolution of the W. H. L. Wallace Post, No. 55, Grand Army of the Republic, of Centralia, Ill., urging increase of pension to \$50 per month; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, for more stringent laws for the punishment of spies and enemy plotters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMILTON: Papers to accompany House bill 9474, granting a pension to George H. Roberts; also papers to accompany House bill 9583, granting an increase of pension to W. K. Wakefield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Oakmont, Pa., favoring constitutional amendment prohibiting polygamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS: Memorial of the Lithuanian Naturalization Club, Lowell, Mass., asking for the restoration of the political independence of Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SNYDER: Memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Utica, N. Y., praying for the conservation and development of the idle water power of the country; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. TALBOTT: Proof relating to pension of Charles N. Emich; also evidence in support of a bill granting a pension to Louisa Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VARE: Memorial of State Board of Agriculture of Pennsylvania, supporting the Weeks bill for the embargo on the importation of plants; to the Committee on Agriculture.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, February 9, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Rev. William Couden, of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our Father who art in Heaven, as we approach another Sabbath we realize that all the blemishes on the closing week have been caused by man. How strange it is! Thou hast made plain to us Thy requirements and indicated the things of shame, and given us the freedom to obey Thee. Yet blindly or willfully Thy children dishonor their relationship to Thee. Vouchsafe Thy forgiveness for aught that any here have said or done that is sinful. And grant Thy continuing grace to help us to become clean and to reconsecrate our all to Thee. Build us up in moral fiber and quicken us in spiritual keenness, that through the work and influence of even the least of us Thy purposes may be carried on toward fulfillment.

Extend the answer to our prayer to all our fellow citizens and our governmental and military enterprises; to our friends, the allies; and even to our enemies.

And from each of us persons here present may there rise to Thee the spirit of the prayer of Dr. Bethune:

O God!
Pardon what I have been;
Sanctify what I am;
Order what I shall be;
And Thine
Shall be the glory;
And mine
The eternal salvation;
Through Jesus Christ, my Lord.

Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO-MORROW.

The SPEAKER. The Chair designates the gentleman from Ohio, Gen. SHERWOOD, to act as Speaker pro tempore to-morrow.

WAR-RISK INSURANCE.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I move to consider House joint resolution 235, extending the time for filing applications for insurance in the War-Risk Bureau from February 12 to April 12, 1918. I will say that a similar resolution, exactly like this in every respect, Senate joint resolution 128, has been passed by the Senate, and I ask that that Senate joint resolution be considered in lieu of the House resolution.

Mr. STAFFORD. I assume that the gentleman asks to have the Senate joint resolution taken from the Speaker's table and considered in the House.

Mr. SIMS. Yes. Let me state briefly that the time for filing applications under the War-Risk Bureau bill expires on the 12th of this month. On account of many applications not being received from the soldiers in foreign lands, it is necessary to extend the time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks to have Senate joint resolution 128 substituted for House joint resolution 235. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I assume that the request of the gentleman is to have Senate joint resolution 128 taken from the Speaker's table and laid before the House.

Mr. SIMS. That is the request, and I was about to explain why it was necessary.

The SPEAKER. The matter is before the House, and the request is to take from the Speaker's table Senate joint resolution 128 and substitute it for House joint resolution 235. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Let the Senate joint resolution be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 128) granting to certain persons in the active war service an extension of time within which application for insurance may be made under section 401 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, as amended by the act approved October 6, 1917.

Resolved, etc., That the time within which application for insurance may be made as set forth in section 401 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, as amended by the act approved October 6, 1917, is hereby extended, with respect to every person in the active war service as to whom the time for making application would expire before the 12th day of April, 1918, so that every such person may make application for insurance up to and including the said 12th day of April, 1918: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to effect an extension of the automatic insurance provided for in the said section 401 beyond the 12th day of February, 1918.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the third reading of the Senate joint resolution.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SIMS, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

House joint resolution 235 was laid on the table.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—IMPEACHMENT OF A. C. WOLFE.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of high privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. NELSON. I offer the following resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That A. C. Wolfe, United States district attorney for the western district of the State of Wisconsin, be impeached before the Senate.

POLITICAL PERSECUTION.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, during the past few months I might have risen to a question of the highest privilege. Under the Constitution, as a Member of the House, I might have impeached a district attorney, who, being a Federal official, permitted his office to be used by others in a manner that I will not now characterize. I prefer to state the facts, and then leave it to Members to pass judgment upon them.

I have not so risen, and I do not now rise, to press this resolution of impeachment for the present. I introduce it now merely that I may discuss the case under the rules of the House.

So far as his removal from office is concerned, it is reported generally in the press of my State that the Attorney General has called for his resignation and named his successor.

I dislike exceedingly to invoke the ponderous impeachment machinery of the Constitution in a matter personal to myself, and I am loath to do anything that would look like taking petty revenge. But had any other person in my district been the victim of this political conspiracy I would have urged a congressional investigation looking to impeachment without a moment's hesitation.

WHY STATEMENT MADE.

I have delayed making any public statement until this case was definitely determined in the courts. The time has now gone by within which a writ of error might have been sued out. I did not wish to try my case in Congress or in the newspapers, but before a judge and jury. I would not make this statement in the House now but for the fact that the judge, in the proper discharge of his duty, found the indictment against me so utterly unfounded in fact and law that he directed the motion to quash, which gave us no further opportunity to present the facts to a jury.

I shall, therefore, do so now, generally, in order that by placing the facts on record I may more fully vindicate my character, the good name of my son, and inasmuch as I am a Member of this body, vindicate so far the honor of the House.

JUDGE QUASHES AND SQUASHES.

The proceedings in the case were interesting but brief. They were over in 20 minutes. An able, unprejudiced, and upright judge read the indictment against myself and my son, asked a few questions about the alleged facts and the interpretation of the law, and thereupon, with caustic comments, he proceeded promptly, pertinently, and peremptorily to put the case out of court. He understood the animus of the case. He not only quashed the indictment: He also squashed the district attorney. I will now read the decision itself that disposed of the matter. The court said:

In view of the fact that there is nothing in the act of Congress and in the proclamation of the President which calls upon citizens of the United States domiciled abroad, either temporarily or permanently, to come home, and, in view of the fact that all the activities of the defendants, so far as appears from the indictment, were prior to the passage of the draft law, it seems to me that a demurrer to this indictment or a motion to quash must prevail.

You have the order, Mr. Clerk, leave to withdraw the plea of not guilty and to file a motion to quash; and upon consideration of the motion to quash, and having heard the arguments of counsel, etc., the motion will be granted and the indictment quashed.

PROCEEDINGS IN COURT.

Let me first briefly describe the scene in court and then quote from the official record, so that you may understand the situation as it presented itself to the mind of an upright judge.

The trial was set for the morning of January 3, but Judge Carpenter had telegraphed that he could not arrive from Chicago until 1 p. m. He arrived promptly at that hour.

Looking around the court room, I saw that my friends had come from far and near, but I could see but few present of those who had worked so industriously to bring about my ruin. Perhaps conscience had told them to stay away. I think they also anticipated the outcome, for it was generally understood that it was "politics."

It was soon apparent that the judge, tall, stern, and commanding, with strong intellectual features, knew his business. No time was lost. He was there for justice and not for politics. He went through the long drawn conspiracy indictment like a prairie fire, making inquiries of the district attorney as to certain parts, and then, commenting aloud, he referred to one part as "inducement" and to another as "camouflage." He knew the law thoroughly. He met the district attorney on every fact and without quibbling or evasion made him face the law.

When the motion for continuance was made by Mr. Wolfe, the court interrupted:

The COURT. I assume that some of these gentlemen here are prospective jurors. Is it customary in this district to make motions of this sort in the presence of the jurors?

I think if there is any place for these gentlemen to sit temporarily that the jurors may be excused during this motion.

The district attorney then read a long affidavit alleging that a Miss Elizabeth Sweets was ill; that her testimony was necessary to prove that some time in April, more than a month before the draft law was passed, Byron had said in her presence that he did not believe in war and would not go to war. The district attorney also set forth that he wished further time to enable the Government to find out whether Byron Nelson had crossed the line when on his honeymoon in the Rocky Mountains near Watertown Lakes.

Mr. Jackman, who, with Mr. Crownhart, represented us, pointed out to the court briefly how immaterial and irrelevant these facts were and how the district attorney had used this same excuse about Byron's crossing the line to put off his trial on his first arraignment before Judge Sanborn. Mr. Jackman further told the court that the only reasons Mr. Wolfe gave a few days before the day set for the trial were that he was busy and wished to look after post-office sites in Madison and Mineral Point.

We asked leave to file counter affidavits setting forth the facts, and then this colloquy took place:

The COURT. Do you raise an issue of fact here?

Mr. JACKMAN. I raise the question as to the ground of this continuance.

Now, furthermore, the court undoubtedly is not familiar with the hodgepodge of politics up in the good State of Wisconsin, perhaps, but the facts with reference to that are set forth in these affidavits. This case has more or less of a political complexion.

The COURT. Not when I am here.

Mr. JACKMAN. I understand.

The COURT. These defendants are just like anybody else, and the Government is just like any other person.

Mr. JACKMAN. But it is being used for that purpose.

The COURT. Who is using it?

Mr. JACKMAN. It is being used by the press and other parties who are in politics.

The COURT. If the press is going too far we will have them in here.

Mr. JACKMAN. Well, I think they ought to be.

After a brief discussion as to the way to take up these cases, the court said:

Why not dispose of the Nelson, jr., case?

Mr. WOLFE. The evidence we are trying to get on his coming into the territorial limits of the United States is material.

The COURT. He is not charged here with anything except that on the 5th of June he failed to register in Madison.

Mr. WOLFE. But there is a question of fact and law to be determined, whether if he does come within the territorial limits of the United States, whether or not it is his duty or whether it is obligatory on his part to register.

The COURT. He is not charged with that. The grand jury have not charged here that he failed within five days after he returned to this country to register somewhere. You charge him with failing to register on the 5th of June in Madison.

Mr. WOLFE. Well, it is his duty to register in Madison.

The COURT. No; he was absolutely exempt, if the statements in the newspapers are anywhere near true that he was out of the country at the time the law was passed; then by the President's proclamation he did not have to be here on the 5th of June.

Mr. WOLFE. Well, there is a question of law there that ought to be determined.

The COURT. Well, that should be disposed of in advance of the trial, it seems to me.

Mr. WOLFE. The question of law should be disposed of.

The COURT. Well, what is the question of law? He is charged with failing to register. Now, what is the question of law? He did not have to register here, because he was not in the country when the act was passed.

Mr. WOLFE. The question of law could come up on a demurrer to this indictment.

The COURT. The indictment is perfectly good. I assume that when the defense comes they will show that he was out of the country on the 5th of June.

Mr. WOLFE. Yes.

The COURT. That settles that case.

Mr. WOLFE. Well, I would like to have the court hold open that argument.

The COURT. What is the legal proposition?

Mr. WOLFE. The legal proposition is that the act of Congress requires citizens of the United States to register regardless of any—

The COURT. Supposing he had been in Paris.

Mr. WOLFE. Well, I say that is a question of law I would like to argue to the court.

The COURT. You can not dignify it by calling it a question of law.

Mr. WOLFE. The President's proclamation could not exempt him under the act of Congress.

The COURT. What did the act say?

Mr. WOLFE. The act made it obligatory on all persons to register.

The COURT. How about those outside the country at the time?

Mr. WOLFE. There was a matter of convenience given them to register.

The COURT. Just read the terms of that exception, if you have it there.

Mr. WOLFE. I have the letter of the Attorney General [handing same to the court].

The COURT. It is the act of Congress we have got to go on here.

Mr. WOLFE. The act of Congress we contend made it obligatory on all citizens of this country to register.

The COURT. The Attorney General seems to state it very plainly here: "The President may prescribe not inconsistent with the terms of the act. This language, of course, absolutely covers male citizens residing abroad as fully and to the same extent as it does male citizens residing in this country. Such persons are subjects of the United States, and as such owe it allegiance."

There is no doubt about that. They may be compelled to perform military service, and while the obligation can not be enforced against them, whenever and wherever the Government can lay hands on them. Now, they could not force this regulation of registration on the 5th of June last, because the Government could not lay their hands on him. They did not. Now, he was indicted for failing to register here. He did not have to, because he was not here and could not. It was a physical impossibility.

Mr. Jackman thereupon called the court's attention to the law, the regulations, and the rulings of the provost marshal. I now quote from the record:

The COURT. Let us take the second case first. I will call the conspiracy case the second case.

Mr. JACKMAN. Yes.

The COURT. Now, Mr. Wolfe, will you state briefly the things charged by the grand jury against the father and son, the Nelsons here, that amount to a crime against the United States? Just what did they do or fail to do? Assume that the young man did not want to go to war; assume that he hoped to evade serving his country and taking that part in the representing of her affairs that most young men would want to take; assume all that, that was his state of mind, and that he deliberately went up to Alberta with the knowledge, perhaps, that such a law would be passed—the draft law—and that he got there, the draft law was passed, it had certain provisions for registration in this country which it was a physical impossibility for him to comply with; and assume he stayed there a certain length of time, and that his father encouraged him; assume that the father knew all of this, and they went closely together as fathers and sons frequently do and should. Assume all that. Now, what is it they have done that has violated a statute of the United States? You see, I have got to look at this thing absolutely unclouded by what seems to be a very unfortunate state of affairs in Wisconsin—a state of affairs which makes it necessary for a Federal judge of a sister State to come here and hear matters that properly belong in this court. As I say, I am looking at this absolutely unclouded. There is no such thing as politics in it. A citizen of this district has been charged with a crime. Is he guilty or not guilty? If he is guilty, he will be punished. If there is no crime charged in this indictment I am going to set him free this afternoon.

Mr. WOLFE. That is the only attitude the Government assumes in this case, none other. The reason that the Government or the grand jury, perhaps, preferred an indictment against JOHN M. NELSON and his son Byron Nelson, is this: After April 6, when a state of war was declared to exist between the United States and Germany, under the act of June 3, 1916, all persons between the ages of 18 years and 45 years were members of the militia of the United States, and all citizens under the law not only owed allegiance but were subject at any time to be called into active military service as soon as Congress took such steps as it deemed proper and necessary to call the men into active military service.

The COURT. Are they charged with conspiring to violate that law?

Mr. WOLFE. No.

The COURT. Or the registration law?

Mr. WOLFE. No; but that comes in connection with the duty—

The COURT. That is inducement.

Mr. WOLFE. I am calling the court's attention to that law to show that at that time, after April 6, both the father and the son owed his duty to the Government.

The COURT. Oh, you can assume that every citizen of the United States owed that duty without any act of Congress—every normal citizen.

Mr. WOLFE. Now, the facts—the facts as the Government expects to prove them—were these: That after the declaration of war Byron Nelson and his father, with others, entered into this unlawful agreement to have Byron Nelson evade any duty that he owed to the Government under this law and any regulation or law that would be passed thereafter.

The COURT. Is there any statute which makes it a crime to conspire together to violate some law to be passed in the future?

Mr. WOLFE. No; but I mention this as the agreement, and this agreement was a continuing agreement from that time on. It continued in force after the draft law was passed on May 18, 1917.

The COURT. Well, now, what overt act do you charge done by either one of the conspirators after the passage of the draft law or the registration law? Because under our statute of conspiracy now there must be some overt act in pursuance of the conspiracy or there is no crime.

Mr. WOLFE. In pursuance of that unlawful agreement and conspiracy—

The COURT. Let us take the case of Nelson, sr. What do you expect to prove that he did after that?

Mr. WOLFE. He continuously after that time advised by letter and telegram, advising his son, both here, while the son was here in Wisconsin and after he left Wisconsin and went to Canada, to leave the State of Wisconsin.

This statement is absolutely untrue. See statement that follows.

The COURT. This was before the law was passed.

Mr. WOLFE. Enter into a partnership, as he called it, marry this young girl now his wife, and take a trip for the Northwest; that this not only might be sufficient to be successful in this enterprise, but it would furnish argument later on which might prove successful in evading the draft law.

This telegram related wholly to his marriage. Mr. Wolfe misconstrues and distorts its whole meaning and purport. See statement following.

The COURT. That is, a law to be passed in the future?

Mr. WOLFE. Yes.

The COURT. Let us assume all that. We have passed that point. We have got the law passed by Congress. What was done after that to carry out the conspiracy?

Mr. WOLFE. After that he sent a telegram to Canada, and while in Canada advised him not to register—a number of telegrams—not to take any steps until he had received his letter and had received further notice, and in one telegram he specifically said not to register.

Here Mr. Wolfe fails to tell the Court that these telegrams were sent in September because he was trying to browbeat and bulldoze Byron. Not one sent before June 5, 1917.

The COURT. Well, aren't we brought right face to face with this proposition, that in the absence of a direct call from the President or the Congress of the United States to our citizens domiciled abroad, under the terms of this act were they obliged to return to this country?

Mr. WOLFE. Yes; under the terms of this act—

The COURT. Now, just a minute. We have a lot of foreign residents; we had them in Mexico, we had them in France, in Italy, some in Germany, and a great many in Canada and in Great Britain. Now, was there anything in that law that required a man to come home, in the absence of a direct request from the President of the United States acting through some regulation of Congress?

Mr. WOLFE. It did not require him to come home, but it required him to register if he was within the draft age.

The COURT. It required him to register in some county in this country, and blanks for that purpose could only be found in this country. No provision is made there for putting his registration in a foreign mail box.

Mr. WOLFE. That provision is not in accordance with the act of Congress, if such an interpretation should be placed on that provision.

The COURT. Well, what is there in the act of Congress that operates outside of the confines of this country?

Mr. WOLFE. This provision right here, section 2.

The COURT. Supposing Congress provided that any American citizen who violated the police regulations in a foreign city should be guilty of a crime. Do you think that law would be good?

Mr. WOLFE. Well, that is probably of a different character.

The COURT. Well, now, wait a minute. Congress is now legislating for somebody that is in a foreign country, one of our own citizens to be sure. Now, what is there in that act that requires the citizen in a foreign country to come back here?

Mr. WOLFE. This provision is section 2, after speaking of the draft: "Such draft as herein provided shall be based upon liability to military service of all male citizens, or male persons not alien enemies who have declared their intention to become citizens, between the ages of 21 and 30 years, both inclusive, and shall take place and be maintained under such regulations as the President may prescribe not inconsistent with the terms of this act."

Mr. JACKMAN. What are you reading from?

Mr. WOLFE. Section 2, page 73.

Mr. JACKMAN. Of the selective-draft law?

Mr. WOLFE. Yes.

The COURT. Is it your contention that applies to citizens of the United States residing in foreign countries?

Mr. WOLFE. It makes no exception.

The COURT. I am asking you.

Mr. WOLFE. Yes; that is my contention.

The COURT. Suppose we had some in Australia. Would the district attorney in Madison, Wis., indict them because they failed to register?

Mr. WOLFE. If they willfully tried to evade the act.

The COURT. It is willfully attempting to evade the act if knowing the existence of the act you fail to carry out its purpose or conform to its provisions.

Mr. WOLFE. This is the provision in this particular case: that a person who leaves this country for that very purpose of evading this act, or has gone, that he is in a position where he can not complain; but the act of Congress makes no exception, but says: "Such draft as herein provided shall be based upon liability to military service of all male citizens, or male persons not alien enemies who have declared their intention to become citizens, between the ages of 21 and 30 years, both inclusive, and shall take place and be maintained under such regulations as the President may prescribe not inconsistent with the terms of this act." Now, there is not any exception made.

The COURT. But there is so much to be found in the balance of the act which indicates that it is meant to apply only to those citizens of the United States that are within her jurisdiction, that I can not see the foundation for your argument.

Mr. WOLFE. Section 5 continues: "That all male persons between the ages of 21 and 30, both inclusive, shall be subject to registration in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the President."

The COURT. Suppose Congress said that every male citizen of the United States should pay a tax of \$2 a thousand on his money in the bank; would that apply to citizens of the United States that were domiciled abroad—I mean in the absence of some specific language—even if it could be done? Would the general language cover it? Of course this is an unusual thing. Nobody dreamed that a thing like this could happen in this country. Now, we must construe that act with reference to normal conditions.

Mr. WOLFE. Section 5 continues: "And upon proclamation by the President or other public notice given by him or by his direction, stating the time and place of such registration, it shall be the duty of all persons of the designated ages, except officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army, the Navy, and the National Guard and Naval Militia, while in the service of the United States, to present themselves for and submit to registration under the provisions of this act; and every such person shall be deemed to have notice of the requirements of this act upon the publication of said proclamation or other notice as aforesaid given by the President or by his direction; and any person who shall willfully fail or refuse to present himself for registration or to submit thereto as herein provided shall be guilty of a misdemeanor."

Then it concluded with this proviso: "Provided further, That in the case of temporary absence from actual place of legal residence of any person liable to registration as provided herein, such registration may be made by mail under regulations to be prescribed by the President." I submit that a person who, with the intent of that particular thing in view, leaves this country and goes to Canada and stays in Canada, as the indictment alleges, that he failed to register at any time after

that time—after June 5—that then he willfully violates the law, especially if he was able to comply with it. The regulations themselves that were issued, section 65, does not make any absolute exception, but uses the words "may be unable to comply with the regulations pertaining to absentees."

The COURT. What are the regulations? Just see what they are and how utterly impossible it would be for one in a foreign country to conform to those regulations, indicating, as I say, that the act of Congress was meant to cover only those citizens of the United States within the jurisdiction of the United States.

Mr. WOLFE. But supposing the Government would be in a position to show that after the issuance of those regulations Byron Nelson did enter the territorial limits of the United States, so that he was in the United States; then it became his duty under these regulations—

The COURT. But he is not indicted for that.

Mr. WOLFE. But he is indicted for failing to register at any time after June 5.

The COURT. Let's see [examining indictment].

Mr. WOLFE. "Or any time thereafter."

Mr. JACKMAN. The conspiracy limits the overt act up to the 15th of June.

Mr. WOLFE. The charge is, "So then and there"—

The COURT. I am sorry I can not listen and read at the same time.

Mr. WOLFE. Oh, I beg your pardon.

The COURT. Now, the charging part says that prior to the 15th of June and on the 6th of April, 1917, they conspired together for the purpose of evading the duty of the younger Nelson to do what he might thereafter be told to do by Congress. That is what this section on page 6 of the indictment amounts to; and the father advised him to go. Where in this indictment is the charge that he returned to the United States? (See statement following.)

Mr. WOLFE. It does not say that he did return to the United States.

The COURT. We have to test the legality of this document by what appears in the eight pages; not by any fact that the Government may have otherwise.

Mr. JACKMAN. May I—

The COURT. Just a minute. * * * I want to ask Mr. Wolfe to be sure and advise me if he has called my attention to every section of the act of Congress which has to do with the registration of citizens domiciled abroad, or is there—I suspect there is not—but is there a single clause in the act of Congress or a single section in the proclamation of the President which refers definitely to American citizens that are outside the jurisdiction of the United States and indicates that the act of Congress and the President's proclamation should affect them?

Mr. WOLFE. There is not a single provision that particularly mentions those persons.

Mr. WOLFE. But the way I construe this regulation it is a mere convenience to the person affected by this regulation. The duty to register is absolute, but for such persons' convenience this regulation was issued. I say that for this reason: That it seems to me inconceivable that Congress could have had in mind such a law that it would permit persons to come and go, leave the country and come back again without those persons being required to obey this law.

The COURT. Well, I presume that he is now registered, isn't he?

Mr. JACKMAN. Yes, sir.

The COURT. The only charging part in this joint indictment is that on and prior to the 15th of June and after the declaration of the state of war between the United States and Germany the defendants conspired and combined together that for the purpose of evading his duty as a member of the national forces of the United States and to avoid the performance of any active military service the said Byron C. Nelson should depart from the territorial limits of the United States and should go to the Dominion of Canada. Now, that you see, while it is very seductive to have the date the 15th of June in there, it is a sort of camouflage that makes us overlook for a moment just what these defendants really did, but when we get down a little further we find that all they did in pursuance of that conspiracy was to counsel the young man to depart the United States prior to the passage of the law, which we know was on the 18th of May. Therefore this all took place prior to the passage of the law, and that is the fact. What I want to find out is what they are charged with subsequent to that?

Mr. WOLFE. They are charged subsequently with a continuance of this agreement.

The COURT. Well, where is it? I can't find it.

Mr. WOLFE. It is in there.

The COURT. It says: "Having entered into the conspiracy and in furtherance thereof, the said Byron C. Nelson, upon the continued counsel and advice of his father, did continue to remain beyond the territorial limits of the United States from the 3d of May, 1917, and after the passage and approval of said act of Congress of May 18, 1917, and the proclamation of the President of the United States issued in pursuance thereof."

In other words, the father counseled the boy that once he was away to stay away. There is no charge here at all that he ever returned to the United States at any time. We get right back to the original proposition; that indictment charges the defendants with a conspiracy to violate a law to be passed at some time in the future by the Congress of the United States. That is the only definite thing in it.

Mr. WOLFE. And then the continuation of that advice after the law was passed.

The COURT. Advising him to stay there.

Mr. WOLFE. Advising him to stay there and not register as required.

The COURT. While he is over there. In other words, advising him that once he is out of the country that he can stay there.

Mr. WOLFE. Not to register, as we contend he must under this act.

The COURT. Nothing in that act from which we can anywhere near require the young man to register from a foreign port or from a foreign city—absolutely nothing.

Mr. WOLFE. In submitting that letter of the Attorney General, perhaps that more clearly states the fact.

The COURT. It is a very interesting letter, and, of course, is entitled to a great deal of respect, but I think he does not pass upon what I think is the controlling question in this case.

In view of the fact that there is nothing in the act of Congress and in the proclamation of the President which call upon citizens of the United States domiciled abroad, either temporarily or permanently, to come home, and, in view of the fact that all the activities of the defendants, so far as appears from the indictment, were prior to the passage of the draft law, it seems to me that a demurrer to this indictment or a motion to quash must prevail.

Mr. JACKMAN. Now, may it please the court, does that apply to both of these indictments?

The COURT. I do not know what the Government wants to do with this other case. As I said before, this indictment—

Mr. WOLFE. I suppose that the Department of Justice in Washington would like to have this matter heard before the higher court.

The COURT. It is a criminal case, and I am not familiar with it. Is there a statute here so that it can be reviewed?

Mr. WOLFE. Oh, yes; that is the reason I desired to have this put in a demurrer.

The COURT. It is a great deal better to do it in this way.

Mr. WOLFE. Because this is an important matter.

The COURT. Because if I should take this case away from the jury, as I undoubtedly would, being of this kind, then the Government could not appeal.

Mr. WOLFE. No; that was the point I made.

The COURT. So we will have a formal order here permitting the defendant to withdraw his plea of not guilty and demurring to the indictment or motion to quash.

Mr. JACKMAN. In the case of Byron C. Nelson and John M. Nelson—

The COURT. I think the other case I will leave for the Attorney General to dispose of by order of nolle pros, because, as I said before, it is a good indictment; you can not demur to it.

Mr. WOLFE. No; but it involves the same proposition of law.

The COURT. And it involves the same proposition of law and it involves the same facts.

Mr. WOLFE. And the Attorney General, I suppose, probably would like to determine that for himself; and if this is to be done this way, probably there ought to be a formal demurrer.

Mr. JACKMAN. I am now filing in the case of the United States v. John M. Nelson and Byron C. Nelson a motion to withdraw the plea of not guilty heretofore filed for the purpose of filing a motion to quash the indictment.

The COURT. That is all right.

Mr. JACKMAN. And I am now filing a motion to quash the indictment against Byron C. Nelson and John M. Nelson upon the ground that the indictment upon the face does not constitute facts sufficient to constitute a crime.

The COURT. That is just the same as a demurrer.

Mr. JACKMAN. I understand a demurrer is not proper.

The COURT. It is not under the equity rules, but I imagine that anything that properly raises the question and presents it to the court of appeals will be sufficient.

Mr. WOLFE. I would like to have the record in such shape so that the department—

The COURT. Oh, an exception will be preserved to the Government. I do not know as it is necessary.

Mr. WOLFE. No; it is not necessary, but I want to be in a position so that we can notify the Attorney General. In matters of this kind the United States attorney usually notifies the Attorney General, and the department determines whether—

The COURT. Whether they want to take it up or not.

Mr. WOLFE. Yes.

The COURT. The court of appeals is now in session in Chicago, and the record, I take it, would take less than a day to have printed.

Mr. WOLFE. But we have to get the ruling of the Attorney General before we take a step of that kind.

The COURT. You have the order, Mr. Clerk, leave to withdraw the plea of not guilty and to file a motion to quash; and upon consideration of the motion to quash, and having heard the arguments of counsel, etc., the motion will be granted and the indictment quashed.

Mr. WOLFE. And the Byron Nelson case—

The COURT. That will rest just the way it is. I will not dispose of that at this time.

Mr. JACKMAN. This young man is registered, and he has a large farm up there, and he is the active man in charge.

The COURT. Well, I think the Attorney General would not have any objection to his departing the jurisdiction of the court if the court did not. I certainly won't have any objection to his going back to Canada.

Mr. WOLFE. I haven't any.

Mr. JACKMAN. He is subject to a call at any time. Now, that case, as I understand, is to stand in statu quo.

The COURT. As I say, the Government may nolle this case in 2 days or 30 days, depending upon what happens to the other, because if the facts won't support the conspiracy case, they won't support the case against the boy.

Mr. WOLFE. They are all grounded on the same question of law.

The COURT. Yes.

This ended the case. The court adjourned. The judge was soon on his way back to Chicago. Newspaper men could hardly grasp, not to say write up, what had happened. Attorneys and clients alike could scarcely realize the full significance of the strange scene we had witnessed. Friends crowded around to shake our hands and to tell us with tears in their eyes how glad they were. Many denounced the persecution bitterly as "dirty politics." One thing is certain—I hope no friend of mine will ever go through an experience like it. In politics men do strange things, and I have gone through many campaigns where my political foes sought to win by using unfair means, but this far surpassed them all in heartless, unjust, and oppressive use of power.

THE BURDEN OF OUR OFFENSE.

Now what was the burden of our offense? My son has a father who is a Member of Congress. For this reason only he is singled out among thousands of Americans abroad of draft age for persecution. As his father is a Member of Congress, it is great stuff for sensational headlines. And that is my offense. Moreover, I vote as I think right, in the fear of God and not man, and, as it is suspected that I may be reelected, desperate means had to be resorted to, and were.

A district attorney was by various indirect and subtle means induced first to swear out a warrant, and then later to go be-

fore a grand jury that was influenced by unfriendly newspaper criticism, and ask for my indictment on a conspiracy charge under a distortion of the facts and an absurd statement of the law.

THE FACTS IN THE CASE.

Now, these are the facts in the case as we were prepared to prove them. I am president of the John M. Nelson Co. (Ltd.), and as such I am temporarily interested in a large farm in Canada. When I took hold of this project, more than five years ago, through my willingness to aid two brothers who had made unfortunate financial investments, I got so entangled with them that I had to get into this foreign business field far deeper than I had ever expected, in order to save them and myself from great financial loss. I thought that I was discharging a brotherly duty, but here was the beginning of this conspiracy.

During these five years in my connection with this farm I have learned some lessons. Among these I mention the fact that it is easier to get in than to get out of a foreign investment, and that farming by proxy 2,500 miles away through hired managers and workmen is not as profitable a business enterprise as to invite general envy.

Looking about, therefore, for some one upon whom I could rely to represent me I quite naturally turned to my son, now 24 years of age. Four years ago, with this thought in mind, I sent him to Canada to spend the summer. During his past three years at college I directed him to take up farm studies; and a year ago last fall when I returned to Madison, where he was attending the State University, I discussed with him quite fully our mutual understanding that he was to go to the farm after graduation in June to do farm work and to prepare himself as manager, so as to relieve me in large part of this burden.

Naturally, I thought that this was merely a family arrangement for sharing burdens and responsibilities, but according to the district attorney this was a continuance of this conspiracy.

THIS GOING NO SECRET.

In November, 1916, a graduate of the University Agricultural College by the name of P. C. Strelow was engaged by us as manager and Egbert Stondall and wife as assistant and cook on the farm. My son bought their railroad tickets for them, saw them off at the station, saying that he would be with them in the spring. After Mr. Strelow had been on the farm a month or two he reported to me that because of the drain upon men for the long war hired help would be high and scarce in Canada. He feared that he would have difficulty in getting the necessary labor to put in the crops. Thereupon, I wrote to my son, urging him to look up farm labor, so that we might send men there if needed; and I told him to arrange to take with him others when he went out in June after graduation.

In the meantime, Byron was enthusiastic over his going to Canada, not only because he wished to relieve me of this burden but also for the reason that the university physicians had told him the dry air would cure him of a throat trouble, and in our family circle it was thought that a few years on a farm would be most helpful, physically and otherwise, for his theological course. Byron had some years previously decided upon the ministry as his calling. With enthusiasm he discussed his going to Canada with all who would listen—his fellow students, his teachers, his relatives, and especially with the members of the family of the young lady whom he was engaged to marry.

If his going was the overt act in a conspiracy he certainly did not keep it secret; and at the trial a dozen witnesses were present to testify to the fact that his going to Canada was planned long before we ever dreamed that the United States would be drawn into the world war.

MARRIAGE PLANS AND WAR.

The district attorney failed to include a very notable person in this alleged conspiracy. In song and story he is called Cupid. He is the real culprit, for he put the secret service agents on the wrong scent.

During the month of August, 1916, Byron became engaged to a young lady with whom he had grown up and attended college. He became engaged with our consent and with the knowledge and consent of her parents. Formal announcement of the engagement was made in December, 1916, and was published in the papers of the city of Madison. It was no secret. His companions at the university all knew of it; the families knew of it; and their friends all knew of it.

It was arranged at the time that they should be married immediately after Byron's graduation from the university in the spring of 1917 and upon the completion of the contract which the young lady had for teaching in the Young Women's Christian Association at Indianapolis. She had graduated from

the university in the spring of 1916. So the young folks planned, but "the course of true love never did run smooth" and great things were about to happen to disarrange their plans.

April 6, 1917, the United States went into the war.

STUDENTS IN WARTIME.

The events that preceded and followed the eventful day that the President read his message to Congress directing a declaration of war are known to us all. At the great universities of the land the students became restless and uneasy. My son wrote me that he could not study. No one was trying to do so. Good students who had formerly received high marks abandoned their work; companies were formed; the boys were drilling; the spirit of unrest permeated the classes.

APPEALS FOR FOOD PRODUCTION.

On the 14th of April the Hon. Emanuel L. Phillip, governor of the State of Wisconsin, issued a proclamation which was headed in the press: "Governor issues proclamation declaring man who works with hoe a patriot" and stating in substance that battles are won with bread and urged the farmers to plant every available acre of ground.

On April 16, 1917, President Wilson issued his "address to fellow countrymen," calling attention to the necessity for increased food supply and stating:

Thousands, nay, hundreds of thousands of persons otherwise liable to military service will of right and of necessity be excused from that service and be assigned to the fundamental, sustaining work of the fields, factories, and mines, and they will be as much a part of the great patriotic forces of the Nation as the men under fire.

UNIVERSITY ACTION.

Following this, and on the 17th day of April, 1917, the faculty of the College of Agriculture of the University of Wisconsin passed the resolution which reads as follows:

Whereas there exists a marked shortage of the world's food supply and our Council of National Defense is looking to the agricultural colleges in this crisis for help in increasing State and National crop production, the faculty of the agricultural college of the University of Wisconsin recommends action as follows:

That all senior, junior, and second year middle course agriculture students be released immediately from academic work for service in food-production campaign;

That all students who normally graduate either now or at the close of the summer session be given their diplomas at the appropriate times if they enter at once upon and continue up to the time of graduation in food-production activities; and

That any student, accepted for this service under the conditions specified below, may receive the total number of credits for which he is at present enrolled. Credit will not be necessarily given as for a particular course but when it is prerequisite for further work for the course later, for which he may receive additional credit.

Any student enrolled in this service in order to receive credit must continue in such service until the opening of the college of agriculture in 1917, unless excused by the committee hereinafter provided. He shall furthermore make such reports and present such evidence as shall be necessary to determine the character of the service performed to be such as to warrant credit.

It is also recommended that a committee to be known as the war council of the college of agriculture be appointed by the dean and that he shall be ex officio chairman of said committee. This committee shall administer the foregoing provisions and other pertinent matters. * * * It is further recommended that the faculty of the college of agriculture urge upon the other faculties of the university the seriousness of the food-supply situation and recommend to their consideration the possibility of such action as will stimulate the co-operation of individuals fitted to render specially valuable service in increase of food supply.

This resolution was printed and had wide circulation through the press in Wisconsin.

A few days later and on the 23d of April, 1917, the faculty of the college of letters passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the faculty of the college of letters and science recognizes the public-service character of agricultural work at this time and approves of the release of students from attendance during the remainder of the semester under conditions substantially the same as those adopted by the college of agriculture. The administration of this grant of absence is left with the executive committee of this college acting in conjunction with the appropriate committee of the college of agriculture.

This resolution was likewise given wide circulation.

On the 25th day of April, 1917, the regents of the university adopted the following resolution:

Voted, That the action of the president of the university and the faculty in releasing members of the faculty and students of the university from their customary work in permitting them to work in the interest of better preparation for war in this State be approved.

STUDENTS RESPOND.

Immediately after the passage of the resolution by the college of letters and science my son, Byron, with about four hundred other students, made application to the proper authorities in the regular manner prescribed by the university faculty to be allowed to go on farms to work. The matter was taken up by the war council. He was granted permission to go on the farm. In the application he stated where he was going and what he expected to do. He filed his reports, sending them to the proper officers, down until the 1st of October, in compliance with the resolution of the faculty, and he was given his degree.

Furthermore, on the 10th of June, 1917, he received a letter from the president of the university which reads as follows:

The university has decided to give an insignia to all students who take part in war service, whether military, food production, industrial, or otherwise. In accordance with this plan there is inclosed herewith a badge to which you are entitled.

Very truly, yours,

CHARLES R. VAN HISE,
President.

This is the badge. It is of bronze in the form of a shield. In the center is the coveted initial W; around this W are the words "University of Wisconsin" and below in larger type "War service."

Previously my son's name had been published in the local newspapers on a "roll of honor."

LONG BEFORE LAW PASSED.

In response, therefore, to the appeals of the governor, the President, and other public men, my son, knowing the need of help upon the farm, after stating his purpose to me by letter and with my approval, under the direction of the university faculty offering him credits as if in attendance at the classes, left for Canada May 2, 1917, taking with him a friend and fellow student, William Chandler, to work upon the farm.

When Byron and Chandler left Madison for Canada they went for the good and sufficient reasons stated, and not as charged to avoid the draft. The draft law had not been passed. No one knew for certain that a draft law would be enacted. Certainly no one was advised as to the provisions of the regulations which were to be promulgated if the law passed, and therefore no one could possibly know the manner in which the draft was to take place.

YOUNG FOLKS WILL MARRY.

While, therefore, the war had not hindered but rather helped his going to the farm in Canada, Byron was nearly distracted over its serious disarrangement of his marriage plans. I voice a universally recognized truth when I say that no red-blooded boy at the age of 23 accepts with undisturbed emotions happenings, however grave, that threaten to postpone indefinitely his marriage day. My son was no exception to the rule.

He was frantic over the uncertainty of things. All sorts of rumors were afloat. He bombarded us with letters and telegrams—all about his marriage tribulations. One day I received a special-delivery letter and a telegram, because he had heard that Congress was about to pass a law prohibiting marriage by persons of military age until after the war. These telegrams the secret-service agents obtained and, of course, misconstrued. Sympathizing with the young folks in their distress, I at first advised marriage whenever her parents would consent, but subsequently, upon calmer consideration, I strongly dissuaded such a course, pointing out to the young folks how the newspapers would misrepresent their motives. In short, acting under the sober advice of the respective parents, and as the young lady disliked to break her contract as a teacher, they decided to postpone the marriage until after his return in June, if he was under the draft, as he expected, or if no conscription bill passed she would go to Canada to him, as they had fondly planned during the winter.

Subsequently it transpired, as I shall soon relate, that being a resident abroad, he was not required to register June 5, the time being wholly voluntary with himself, so upon the completion of her work as teacher, in order to save the loss of labor and the expense of his returning to the United States, and especially to keep his agreement with the university faculty to work on the farm until October, it was arranged that they be married in Lethbridge, Canada. Her parents attended the wedding, going from the farm to the Glacier National Park on a summer vacation. My son and his bride took a few days off for their honeymoon, and thereupon both returned to the farm, went to work, and remained there until he came back in October under circumstances which I shall state. At no time after he left the university on the 2d day of May, 1917, down until the time when he returned and registered was my son within the territorial limits of the United States.

BYRON TRIES TO REGISTER.

That my son did not go to Canada to avoid the draft, and that I did not direct him to do so, will now conclusively appear. Several letters were received by me at Washington from my son, asking what was necessary for him to do with reference to registering and urging us to keep him informed. I told my secretary, a Wisconsin man, subject to registration, to look up Byron's case as he attended to his own. When the President's proclamation was issued, providing for registration by absentees, I asked my secretary to go to the district board to procure a card for my son. As it takes six days for a letter to reach Spring Coulee, Alberta, Canada, from Washington, my son, without waiting for us, had written a letter to the county clerk of his home county asking

that a registration card be sent him. His friend and fellow student, Chandler, had received a card from his father by mail. This card was shown Byron and Mr. Strelow, and on Sunday, May 27, Chandler filled it out. How this card was obtained under the regulations I do not understand. It was clearly contrary to the regulations for clerks to give out blank cards. Byron and Strelow sat down and each wrote a letter directed to the county clerk of Dane County, Madison, Wis., in which they stated in substance the facts called for in Mr. Chandler's card. Mr. Strelow took these letters, together with other letters written on the same date and the one inclosing the registration card of Chandler, and on the morning of the 28th of May mailed these letters at Spring Coulee, Alberta, Canada. Mr. Chandler's card reached his district board, but Byron and Strelow never received any response to their letters. At the trial this fact would have been proven by seven witnesses.

TOLD HE CAN NOT REGISTER.

In the meantime my secretary at Washington reported to me that he had obtained his card from the district board, but that he was unable to get any card for Byron, because of the fact that he was outside of the territorial limits of the United States. He said that he had been referred to the Provost Marshal's office, that he had made inquiries from that office, and had been informed that no card could be given him, for the reason that no provision had yet been made for the registration of Americans outside the territorial limits of the United States, and that consequently there was no method whereby they could register.

Three days later, the 25th day of May, in order to verify the statements of my secretary, I personally made inquiry from the office of the Provost Marshal General and was informed by the officer in charge exactly what my secretary had reported, and I was further advised that if I would look at section 65 of the regulations I would find that persons outside the territorial limits of the United States were not required to register until five days after their return to the United States.

I sent to my son a copy of the regulations, together with a statement as to what I had been told by the Provost Marshal's office.

If the writing of that letter and the sending of this information was a conspiracy, the Provost Marshal who framed the law and the regulations should have been indicted as the chief conspirator!

PROVOST MARSHAL'S RULES.

Later, on the 12th day of June, 1917, the Provost Marshal General issued what is known as Form 15, headed "Information as to registration of American citizens resident abroad," and to which form was signed the name of the Provost Marshal General. The first section of this form provides as follows:

At the present time (June 12, 1917) the registration of American citizens resident without the jurisdiction of the United States is not compulsory.

After the newspaper reports with reference to the action of the district attorney at Madison had been called to my attention, I personally went to the office of the Provost Marshal General, and on September 1, 1917, I received a letter from the Provost Marshal General signed by Harry L. Watson, captain of the Seventeenth Cavalry, which reads as follows:

With reference to the registration of persons residing in Canada or elsewhere without the jurisdiction of the United States, the statements contained in the bulletin, Form 15, hereto attached are still correct.

LAW AND REGULATIONS.

At the time of my inquiry at the Provost Marshal General's office, May 25, I was referred to certain sections of the registration regulations, and I examined these myself. Section 5 of the act of May 18 provides that all male persons between the ages of 21 and 30, both inclusive, shall be subject to registration in accordance with the regulations to be prescribed by the President. The latter part of the same section provides that—

In case of temporary absence from actual place of legal residence of any person liable to registration as provided herein, such registration may be made by mail under regulations to be prescribed by the President.

In the registration regulations promulgated May 18, 1917, by the President, section 2 provides, among other things:

These regulations pertain only to the registration of all male persons in the United States, the Territories, and the District of Columbia, between the ages of 21 and 30, inclusive, and are published for the direction and guidance of all concerned.

Section 6 provides that all correspondence relating to the execution of the act shall be addressed to the office of the Provost Marshal General.

Section 64 provides for the machinery whereby persons in the United States in States distant from their own State may apply to the proper officers in the county or city, but no provision is made of any kind in the regulations of the President in cases

where a person is outside the territorial limits of the United States.

Section 65 provides:

Registration of persons at sea or abroad: Male persons within the designated ages who, on account of absence at sea or on account of absence without the territorial limits of the United States may be unable to comply with the regulations herein pertaining to absentees, will, within five days after reaching the first United States port, register with the proper registration board, or as herein provided for other absentees.

My construction of these regulations and of the law at the time was in accord with the instructions received from the Provost Marshal, also a memorandum from the Secretary of War to the Secretary of State in which he says that registration on the part of citizens abroad has not been made compulsory, and the printed instructions to consuls by the Secretary of State, in which he informs them that registration on the part of citizens abroad is wholly voluntary.

This construction is further absolutely confirmed by the selective-service regulations prescribed by the President under date of November 8, 1917. Section 53 of these regulations provides, among other things:

Citizens or persons who have declared their intention to become citizens who have not hitherto registered on account of absence without the territorial limits of the United States are required to register within five days after their return to the United States.

Section 56, headed "Registration of persons residing abroad," contains, among other things, the following language:

Citizens and persons who have declared their intention to become citizens, residing abroad, are not required to register.

A REMARKABLE OFFENSE.

In short, Mr. Speaker, my son had gone to this farm in Canada before the draft law was passed, under the auspices of his university, responding to the call of the governor of the State and the President of the Nation to all patriotic citizens to produce food for the country and her allies, for which service my son received a letter of praise and an insignia in bronze from his university as a memento of his patriotism; yet he was indicted for a dereliction of duty, and I was indicted for transmitting to him rulings received from the Provost Marshal General, who was authorized to make such rulings by the President of the United States under the act of Congress.

NATURE AND PROGRESS OF CASE.

The question naturally presents itself, Why did the district attorney do it? Who were behind him, urging him on, and using him to accomplish their political ends? These questions have been put to me often by men who know that political persecutions of this kind are not carried on unless people in places of power or influence are back of them. I will, therefore, set forth the nature and the progress of this case in some detail.

WAR AND POLITICS.

I have the honor to represent the capital city, and I live at Madison, where the State capitol is located. It follows from this fact that in my home city are some goodly number of politicians, in and out of office, who take a lively interest in politics.

Some of these leading politicians, not friendly to me politically, served on the grand jury. The district attorney, of the opposite political party, was a stranger to me, but associated closely with my political opponents.

Until very recently there were only two daily papers in my home city, one of the opposite political party, and as such quite naturally takes a shot at me from time to time. The other used to be of my party and was edited by a friend, who turned against me because I did not fully share his views. He permitted my enemies to use his columns freely for hostile communications, and from time to time he directed his editorial batteries at me.

This hostility began soon after my vote on the so-called armed neutrality bill. A number of men who have been opposed to me in factional politics, representatives of the local public-service corporations and other financial interests, started an agitation that was taken up by this daily newspaper. This agitation resulted in organizing what they called the "Never-again Nelson Club," and these political enemies went so far as to have celluloid buttons made with the letters N. A. N. printed on them. This action was supposed to result from my vote against the armed neutrality bill.

As a result of this agitation the faculty of the university sent me petitions, a large parade was organized, lengthy resolutions were sent by wire, and generally the utmost pressure brought to bear to secure my vote for war. But I did not so vote.

After war was declared, it being now the question of being loyal to the law of the land and to the flag of our country, I supported, with one or two exceptions, the President's entire pro-

gram. This fact was either carelessly overlooked or purposely ignored by these prejudiced people.

STIRRING UP SECRET SERVICE.

The opportunity that my political enemies were looking for presented itself in this way: During the month of August, 1916, this newspaper learned that my son, Byron, was in Canada; that he was not registered, and had recently been married. The account of his marriage was written up in a way to convey the suggestion that he had gone to Canada to escape the draft. This paper thereupon began to print statements alleged to come from the United States district attorney, Mr. Wolfe, with reference to my son being in Canada and not registered. These stories were continued from day to day, and finally the paper printed the sensational news item that the district attorney intended to swear out a warrant for my son's arrest.

Prior to that time, after war had been declared, a number of Secret Service men had been sent to Madison, the chief of whom was a Mr. Spencer. They sent a telegram to the Bureau of Investigation at Washington inquiring if my son had registered in the District of Columbia. I was called up over the telephone and gave them generally the facts that I have stated to you. Later, in answer to a letter, I sent the bureau a statement giving detailed information.

AT OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL.

A week or ten days later I learned from the Associated Press that the district attorney had sworn out a warrant for my son's arrest. I thereupon went to the Department of Justice to consult this Mr. Keen, with whom I had talked over the telephone. He took me up to the Assistant Attorney General, Mr. Fitts, who has charge of the criminal division of the department. After I had stated the facts to them, Mr. Fitts said:

Well, Mr. Keen, if this young man was in Canada more than two weeks before the law passed, how could he violate the law?

They asserted emphatically that the action of the district attorney had not been directed by them, and assured me that they would ask him to report on the case at once. Subsequently I presented a statement in the form of a letter to the Attorney General, stating the facts and the law in detail, citing the rulings of the Provost Marshal, the memorandum of the Secretary of War, and the instructions to consuls from the Secretary of State, and a copy of this letter was sent to the district attorney.

At my interviews with Mr. Fitts I found him frank, fair, and just. He gave me emphatically to understand that he failed to see how the district attorney could charge my son with violation of the law. He inquired of me who was back of this prosecution, advised me to go home, it being near the end of the session, to see who was stirring up the matter.

PATRIOTISM AND POLITICS.

My presentation of the law and the facts to the district attorney put an end to the persecution, so far as I could observe, for a period of six weeks. But during this time Mr. Wolfe and the secret-service agent, Mr. Spencer, were importuned by my political foes on the streets and over the telephone; newspaper reporters, unfriendly to me, came to interview them day after day on the Nelson matter, asking what they intended to do, and why they did nothing. Telegrams were sent to Washington to the Department of Justice by the chairman of the State Council of Defense for the State of Wisconsin, and by the secretary of the Dane County Council of Defense, urging the prosecution of my son. Both of these men have been for years members of a faction opposed to me. It is a most significant fact in this connection that on the 31st day of December, 1917, but a few days before the time set for the trial at Madison for conspiracy against Byron and myself that the chairman of the Dane County Council of Defense announced himself as a candidate for my seat in Congress. How much the chairman knew of the action of his secretary I can not say; but the fact is that the secretary telegraphed in the name of the Dane County council.

ANOTHER OPPONENT'S PLATFORM.

Previously another severe critic had announced his candidacy for my seat, using as a defense of his action an alleged newspaper interview. I present it here as an interesting specimen of the newspaper persecution I had to endure. The regular reporters of the newspaper associations were generally fair. I gave each of them a brief statement at the time the district attorney swore out his warrant against my son, showing his innocence of the charge. But two days later a reporter tried to interview my wife over the telephone on the subject of "conscientious objectors." She declined to be interviewed and told him to await my arrival. Upon my return home after a session of Congress this persistent fellow called me up. I told him that I would give out no interview. He said something offensive, and so I

promptly hung up the receiver. This is the dispatch that he sent out to the newspapers of the country and printed in my home paper:

WASHINGTON, August 31, 1917.

Congressman NELSON, Wisconsin, to-day said that both he and his son, whose arrest as a slacker is threatened by Government officials, are "conscientious objectors." Further, he admitted he gave his son advice to go to Alberta wheat farm to escape military service.

Not only did this false interview bring out a candidate for Congress against me but I was threatened by a very prominent lawyer of my home city until I had explained to him by telegram that the item was sheer fabrication. This is the telegram I sent:

Statement false, defamatory, libelous—a willful reporter's deliberate lie.

GETTING BEHIND GRAND JURY.

My statement of the facts and the law had also put a stop to the newspaper propaganda. Very little was published about the case. But on the 20th of October, a month and 20 days after Mr. Wolfe had sworn out the warrant, he announced to the reporters that the grand jury, then in session, had indicted my son on the same charge.

Just why the district attorney did nothing after learning of the provost marshal's ruling, having sworn out his warrant September 1, and then presented the matter to the grand jury more than a month afterwards, I never could understand unless it be that he could not withstand the pressure. At any rate, I had gone home for the brief vacation taken by Congress, and at once, upon learning of the indictment by a grand jury, I decided that the best course was to end the matter by telegraphing my son to return, to register, and then to demand an early trial. Without any warrant being served on him, he returned, registered, and was assigned the serial No. 4456 and order 1284-A in full compliance with the act of May 18, 1917, and section 5 of the President's regulations.

A plea of not guilty was thereupon entered and an immediate trial asked for, to which the district attorney refused his consent.

REPORTERS AND POSTPONEMENT.

After I had returned to Washington for the December session I learned from the newspapers, November 28, that the district attorney had also secured from the grand jury an indictment of me and my son for conspiracy. Before either of these indictments were served or before any intimation to either myself or my attorneys, and before these indictments were actually filed in the United States court, the district attorney called the reporters and gave to them a full statement with reference to the indictments. My attorney had surmised from his talk with the district attorney and the secret-service agent that they were also trying to get an indictment against me, for it was rumored at the courthouse that the one they were after was not the boy but the father. District Attorney Wolfe was specifically asked by my attorney if any action was taken by the grand jury against me that notice be given to my attorneys immediately upon the return of the indictment. The district attorney made the promise to do so, but he failed to keep his promise. My attorneys learned of my indictment from the newspaper reporters. Upon being told by the newspapers of the action of the grand jury I immediately went to Madison and my son again immediately returned from our farm in Canada, where he had gone with full permission and knowledge of the local draft board and of the United States district judge. A plea of not guilty was entered, and a motion made for an immediate trial, not only in the conspiracy case but the motion was also renewed for an immediate trial in my son's case. Again the district attorney refused to give his consent.

CASE SET FOR TRIAL.

However, District Judge A. L. Sanborn stated that we were entitled to a speedy trial; that he did not think it proper for him to sit in the case by reason of the fact that his son, John B. Sanborn, who is an attorney in the city of Madison, had advised with reference to these cases with Mr. Spencer, of the Secret Service; that, therefore, he would call in another judge, and that he would go to Chicago on the following day to ask Judge Carpenter, of the northern district of Illinois, to sit in the cases at as early a date as possible. This was done. The date was set for January 3, 1918. Again the information was given to the newspaper reporters by the district attorney's office before my attorneys were notified.

ON EVE OF TRIAL.

On the 28th day of December, 1917, in the afternoon, one of my attorneys called up the district attorney and asked which case he would try first, and as to the return of Mr. Strelow, the former farm manager, who was then stationed at Jefferson Barracks, Mo.

The motive for this inquiry was the fear on the part of my attorneys that the district attorney might fail to keep his promise to subpoena Mr. Strelow.

It was during this conversation that my attorneys first learned that the district attorney sought a further postponement of the cases. He asked them to agree to a continuance, stating as his reasons that he was busy; that he had some matters which the department wanted him to take up immediately; that he had to look up some matters with reference to the post-office sites at Madison and Mineral Point.

My attorneys informed me that these were the only reasons assigned for any adjournment of the trial until the afternoon of the 3d of January, the day set for the trial. On the grounds assigned, my attorneys refused to consent to any adjournment.

It developed subsequently that the district attorney had sent the secret-service man, Mr. Spencer, to Chicago to interview Judge Carpenter with reference to a continuance, and no notice of any kind was given either to me or my attorneys with reference to the matter.

Before the day set for the trial my son again returned from Canada, where he was acting as manager of the farm. I returned from Washington. Witnesses were subpoenaed on our behalf from long distances. Some Members of this body and a member of the Cabinet came from Washington, and the young man who had been manager of the farm during the month of June, 1917, now in the United States Army, was brought back.

My attorneys prepared affidavits to resist postponement, which we feared, for it meant not only great expense and loss of time, but also holding the case over my head in the courts indefinitely.

ONLY SPECTATORS.

The proceedings in court have been set forth. The district attorney made the motion to put the trial off; my attorneys asked leave to file and to read counter affidavits. The judge asked for the indictments and that ended the case. My son and I were not subjected to the humiliation of a trial. With our attorneys we sat as spectators enjoying the skill and courage with which the judge legally, if not literally, wiped the court-room floor with the district attorney and then threw him out of court. The judge presented the law. Mr. Jackman whispered to Mr. Crownhart immediately after the court had made his first comment on the indictment: "We will find ourselves out of a job here in a few minutes." We were not surprised. My lawyers and I knew that no upright judge would let a case of this kind go to a jury.

A DISTRESSING EXPERIENCE.

Mr. Speaker, I have undergone a most distressing experience in being indicted for crime. No one can understand who has not experienced it how distasteful is the notoriety; how trying it is to mother, wife, and children; how heartlessly cruel are some newspapers and reporters; how quickly a large part of the public condemns before conviction; how unpleasant it is to know that detectives dog your footsteps, ransack your telegrams, open your mail and the mail of your attorneys; but we were sustained by the consciousness of innocence, by the confidence and prayers of many friends, and by a firm faith in the overruling providence of Almighty God.

PERSECUTION.

Persecution is after all no great misfortune. It is the price we must often pay for a clear conscience. It comes to every man who dares to stand true to his convictions when others weakly bend to the varying storms that blow. Suffering and persecution brings out of us the best that is in us, and is the hour of trial that tests the love and loyalty of those we call our friends.

GOOD FRIENDS.

I wish now to express publicly my deepest gratitude to my colleagues, HENRY ALLEN COOPER, the dean of the Wisconsin delegation in Congress; to EDWIN Y. WEBB, chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House; and to Albert S. Burleson, the Postmaster General of the United States, who were on their way to Wisconsin to testify in my behalf. Mr. Burleson called me up over the telephone on the morning after my indictment to assure me of his sympathy and sincere friendship. He tendered me his services in any way that I might require them. I assured him that all I desired was a speedy trial. He readily expressed his willingness to go to Madison as a witness, and he reached Chicago before I could inform him of the abrupt termination of the case.

But for the death of a member of his family Senator OSCAR UNDERWOOD would also have made the journey. He offered gladly to make a deposition as to my character, loyalty, and patriotism. Likewise our honored Speaker, CHAMP CLARK, who gave me a copy of a letter he had previously written denouncing this prosecution in the strongest possible terms, would have

made the trip to Madison, if he could have appointed a Speaker pro tempore for more than a day. How strong the ties are that we form in this body I have tested in my own experience, and the recollection of the devoted friendships of these men and others whom I can not name will never be effaced from my mind and heart as long as life shall last.

FINAL DEFEAT.

Defeated in court, my political foes sought to convey the impression in the newspapers by announcing an appeal that justice had failed, but as the Attorney General has refused their demand, their purpose to hold this charge over my head in the courts has failed. Now they must come out in the open; now they must reveal themselves, their candidates, and their false issues. I shall meet them fearlessly on my whole record. I have had in mind but one goal, the public welfare; to that goal I followed but one pathway and one principle—the truth and the right—and I have but one motive—love of my fellow men, love of country.

With a faith, therefore, firmly founded on the knowledge of the rectitude of my intentions, the sanity of my convictions, and the unselfishness of my efforts in the discharge of my duties as a Member of Congress, I shall again await, as often before, the verdict of approval of the supreme court which, under God, passes final judgment upon our records as public servants.

Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to withdraw the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not have to obtain leave. The gentleman withdraws the resolution.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3689. An act authorizing the Postmaster General to cancel or readjust the screen-wagon contract of H. H. Hogan at Kansas City, Mo.; and

S. 3648. An act for the retirement of public-school teachers of the District of Columbia.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9314, the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill, with Mr. HUMPHREYS in the chair.

The Clerk read as follows:

Emergencies arising in the Diplomatic and Consular Service.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and wish in this connection to make a parliamentary inquiry. I desire to know whether the paragraph that is about to be read ends with line 12, on page 9, or terminates on line 8. It will be noticed there is a proviso which directly affects the matter in the preceding lines, beginning on line 9.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state that in his opinion the paragraph ends with line 12, page 9.

Mr. STAFFORD. Very well, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the President to meet unforeseen emergencies arising in the Diplomatic and Consular Service and to extend the commercial and other interests of the United States and to meet the necessary expenses attendant upon the execution of the neutrality act, to be expended pursuant to the requirements of section 291 of the Revised Statutes, \$700,000, to be immediately available, together with the unexpended balance of the appropriation made for this object for the fiscal year 1918, which is hereby reappropriated and made available for this purpose:

Provided, That in his discretion the President may employ part of this fund for payment for personal services in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. We have two provisions here that are subject to points of order, that making immediately available this very large appropriation of \$700,000 for an item where the appropriation last year was but \$150,000, and the proviso leaving it in the discretion of the President to employ this fund for personal service in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law. I may say that in conference with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations he advised me that the Department had not made any estimate for this service for the remainder of the present fiscal year, but that if it was urgently necessary it could be done when the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, which is to be reported in a few days to the House, would be considered in the Senate. I believe this appropriation of \$150,000 has been increased by

a deficiency appropriation running to several hundred thousand dollars already during the present fiscal year.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, the reason for this provision is that it is out of this fund that the State Department pays, to a great extent now, the secret service and proposes to pay all of the additional secret service that it will have to employ during the next year. That secret service, as the gentleman is aware, has done a remarkably beneficial work for this country and for our allies since the war began. This appropriation had been \$200,000. Last year it was cut down to \$150,000 upon the suggestion of the Secretary of State that he did not need any more than \$150,000, but after this bill was passed last year the war broke out and a great deal more money has been needed in carrying on the secret-service work, and the secret-service work in the State Department is principally paid for from this fund.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I recall the testimony of Secretary Lansing, before the Committee on Appropriations, the President has allotted a considerable amount of the \$100,000,000 emergency appropriation to the department for utilization for this very purpose of advancing the secret-service work and detecting spies and enemies of the Government.

Mr. FLOOD. He has; but the President dislikes to do that; and they prefer to have it in this appropriation, and in order to make it effective the Secretary stated to the committee that it would be necessary to have some men of high class employed in the District who would stay here for the purpose of giving direction to the secret-service force of the State Department, and he was exceedingly anxious that he be permitted to employ a few men here, and that proviso was inserted to meet the provision of law that prevented that very thing.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can we have the assurance of the chairman of the committee, because it has been a moot question between the respective Committees of Foreign Affairs and Appropriations as to whether any appropriation in the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bills should be utilized for the payment of clerical services in the District of Columbia, that in case this proviso is allowed to remain in the bill and the war is ended when the next Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill is under consideration, that he will eliminate this proviso?

Mr. FLOOD. I give the gentleman the assurance that if I am on the committee I shall vote to do that, and I believe that will be the action of the committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman any serious objection to having the words "immediately available" stricken out? I am pressing the point of order largely upon the suggestion of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who stated that it could be submitted to the Senate and presented as a part of the urgent deficiency bill. I desire in no wise to restrict in amount or activity the work of the State Department in ferreting out spies.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I would ask for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FLOOD. When does the gentleman think that appropriation can be made?

Mr. STAFFORD. The urgent deficiency bill will be the next appropriation bill, I am informed, that will be brought in the House for consideration. It will be brought up very shortly and will likely pass before this bill is finally enacted.

Mr. FLOOD. Well, I think with that statement that there is no objection to striking those words out.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order, except as to the words "to be immediately available."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment. Page 9, line 6, strike out the word "final" and insert the word "fiscal." It is merely a typographical error.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

The clerk read as follows:

Contribution to the maintenance of the International Bureau of Weights and Measures, in conformity with the terms of the convention of May 24, 1875, the same to be paid, under the direction of the Secretary of State, to said bureau on its certificate of apportionment, \$2,895.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, for five minutes to speak on a subject not connected with this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to speak for five minutes out of order. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, there has been some complaint throughout the press of the Nation and probably on the part of parents of soldiers abroad in respect to mail not being properly delivered to them. In view of the very splendid speech made by the able gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] the other day, a little later on in my remarks I am going to ask leave to incorporate a letter which I have received from the Postmaster General to a very large extent explaining the delay. Of course the Post Office Department makes no denial of the fact but what there are delays, and I am going to call upon every Member of this House to read his statement. In my opinion the Postmaster General has done everything that is humanly possible in order to get the mails promptly to the soldiers abroad. He has selected Mr. John Clark, formerly of Cincinnati, Ohio, to be director of postal affairs on our fighting front.

It has been my pleasure to know Mr. Clark rather intimately for 15 or 18 years. I am sure in five minutes' conversation with Mr. Clark any Member of this House would be impressed with Mr. Clark's greatness. I am sure that in one hour's interview with him in regard to postal facilities, he could convince any Member of the House that few and far between are the men in this country who know more about the mails than he does. Mr. Clark was selected for this work; he did not seek it himself. He was selected solely because of his great ability to do this line of work. He is not only over there in person, but his own boy is fighting in the trenches side by side with other soldiers, and, if I mistake not, another son is in a cantonment in this country. Now, I am informed that there has been no complaint about mails failing to reach our naval forces in European waters. The director of mails of England, over here a short time ago, informed our postal authorities that England had the same trouble that we are having now, and they had it for six months. The trouble comes, gentlemen, because the troops as yet are not stationary. They are moving from point to point and place to place. After these mails are delivered at the distributing place, wherever that may be, the mail is then taken charge of exclusively by the military branch of our Government, and I am not going to say, nor does the Post Office Department say, that even the military authorities should be blamed or criticized in failing to get the mail properly to the soldiers—

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. COX. In a moment—because our troops are being shifted from point to point and place to place, and it makes it very difficult to forward the mail to the addressees. Now I yield for a question.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Do I understand that the mail from here to our soldiers in France goes to Paris for redistribution?

Mr. COX. Not quite all of it—

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I did not know—

Mr. COX. I do not think quite all of it, but a majority of it probably does.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I should think it would be wholly unnecessary for any of it to go there.

Mr. COX. Now, when we consider, gentlemen, for a moment that the mail which reached Paris between the 21st and 23d of December comprised 30,000 sacks of field mail, which required 90 freight cars to carry that mail from port of landing to the final distribution, we begin to get some idea of the tremendous task the War Department is up against in order to get this mail over there. The criticism carried in the press of the country I think has mainly been directed against the Post Office Department. I say the Post Office Department is not criticizing the military branch of the Government and I am not criticizing it, far from it; but if there is any fault to be found, and I do not think there is any, even in the remotest degree it is in the military branch because of the incapacity to get mail to soldiers who are constantly being shifted from point to point and from place to place.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert as a part of my remarks a letter which I received from Mr. Praeger, Second Assistant Postmaster General, a letter which he directed to Chairman Moon, of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, and a resumé or explanation of the apparent delay of mail in reaching our forces abroad.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing certain documents which he has indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want to say that due to the great courtesy of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] I was permitted yesterday to examine the material which he proposes to insert in the Record.

I think it is a valuable contribution to the somewhat voluminous literature on this subject, and I hope that it may go into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] a question.

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. It will take but a moment. Of course mail addressed by any person in the United States to a soldier in France is simply addressed to the soldier, care of the American Expeditionary Force; rarely, if ever, is the battalion, regiment, or company placed on the envelope. Sometimes it is.

Mr. COX. That is true.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Now, naturally that must go into the hands of a competent military person in France or they would never know where the man was. There is no such individual in Paris who does know. Now, I just assume that if the Post Office Department is sending all this mail to Paris it then has to be sent to some other place, because there is no one in Paris that knows where those men are, absolutely no one. That can be said without qualification. They may know where some of them are, but there is no place where they really know except in the Division of Intelligence on the General Staff, in one place. It is a problem we know nothing whatever about, and I am interested to know that this gentleman, Mr. Clark, who is said to be a very competent man, is going over to take charge of it. But I would like to suggest this, that if the Post Office Department sends a man over to take charge of it, let him have complete charge of it and organize the Post Office Department over there so that it will take into contemplation the peculiarities of the situation. Even that would not explain the long delays in mail coming from that country here. May I give an illustration?

Mr. COX. Surely.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I wrote a letter in Paris. I think it was about the middle of October. I arrived here on the 30th day of November, and I got here the very day that letter arrived in Washington. I did not start until the middle of November. Now, there was a month that was lost somewhere. Possibly the letter may have been in the censor's hands. If I understood the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] the other day, most of the mail coming from Europe here is coming with reasonable celerity.

Mr. COX. That is what the Post Office Department says.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. There are many instances, however, quite to the contrary, but it is the mail from here over there and not the mail from there here. What observation I was able to make is entirely in harmony with the very exhaustive study of the question made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS], and is clearly set forth in the House. And I think the Post Office Department has a lot to do.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I will be pleased to, but I do not know anything about the subject.

Mr. COX. I want to put this query to the gentleman: Has the gentleman taken this subject up with the postal authorities down here?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. No; because I have no personal interest in it.

Mr. COX. I will say this—and I think I can speak for the Post Office Department—they would not only court criticisms but inquiries from the Members of the House and take these questions up with the proper authorities, and I think the gentleman from Minnesota could probably get considerable information, if he would make an inquiry, that he would not like to put in the Record, such as I have with me now, and if I would put it in I would probably strike it out for fear we might get up some friction between the Post Office Department and the Military Establishment until the two lines of work are thoroughly worked out between the Post Office Department on the one side and the military branch on the other.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. I have just come from a hearing which is being conducted by the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department on this general question, and the testimony, apparently from men who are thoroughly familiar with the inside of the postal situation, indicates that the delay in a large measure occurs at the Chelsea terminal in New York City after the letters and packages come in from their various points of mailing and before they are put upon the steamer and destined to Europe. Has the gentleman any information to that effect?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks for three minutes more, out of order. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ROGERS. This testimony continues that the delay involving censoring is sometimes a matter of weeks just in New York City before the letter or parcel starts on its way. Has the gentleman any information that is specifically directed to that phase of the situation?

Mr. COX. No; I have not. The Post Office Department does not seem to think the delay occurs there. We appropriated this year, as I recall now, \$1,600,000 to take charge of our censorship bureau in the city of New York. I think if the gentlemen will read this statement that I am now putting in the RECORD they will find the Post Office Department clears itself of that charge.

Now, just one further thought. Some one stated here the other day that there were not enough postal employees abroad. There were not many who went over there in the first instance, probably less than 40, but in the last three weeks I think 26 additional have gone over, and it becomes a question of transportation to get the clerks in this country transported to France. So they are putting over there all the employees they can possibly get their hands upon and they can get transportation for to handle the postal affairs in France.

Mr. DILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I will.

Mr. DILL. Does the matter to be put in the RECORD show the number of employees in the postal service in France?

Mr. COX. As I recall now by the evidence before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, it was about 40.

Mr. DILL. I wondered whether what the gentleman is going to print would show the number.

Mr. COX. No; it does not show it. Since that time there have been some 25 or 30 who have gone over.

Mr. DILL. Does the gentleman know whether there has been any increase in the number of employees?

Mr. COX. Twenty-five or thirty have gone over in the last two or three weeks.

Mr. KEARNS. Is the Government experiencing any difficulty in finding means to transport 40 or 50 men to France?

Mr. COX. The transportation problem is a very serious one.

Mr. KEARNS. How, then, would they undertake to transport over there a million men, or 500,000 men, if they are having trouble in getting 40 or 50 over?

Mr. COX. The gentleman had better address that inquiry to the Secretary of War.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. What explanation does the Post Office Department give for the enormous loss of packages sent over there?

Mr. COX. If the gentleman will read this statement, I think he will find that there are not many packages lost. Ordinarily a parcel-post package will not travel nearly as fast as a letter. A man over there gets a letter saying that a package has been sent. The package does not arrive at the same time as the letter, and the man writes back that the package has not come. There is a complaint. Before the department here can get out a tracer for that package, in many, many cases, to see where it was lost, a letter comes back from the receiver of the package stating that it has reached its destination all right.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I had a series of complaints from a number of parties, which indicated that quite a large percentage of the packages were lost.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana to extend his remarks as indicated?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 7, 1918.

Hon. WILLIAM E. COX,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. COX: In view of the very great interest you have taken in the Army Postal Service abroad, I am transmitting herewith a copy of a letter, and its accompanying inclosures, which I have this day addressed to the Hon. JOHN A. MOON, chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, House of Representatives.

Yours, very truly,

OTTO PRAEGER,
Second Assistant Postmaster General.

FEBRUARY 7, 1918.

Hon. JOHN A. MOON,
Chairman Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am transmitting herewith some information on the handling of the expeditionary mails in France, which I think will interest you in view of the speech of Representative ROGERS, of Massachusetts.

We are sending more than a million letters and considerably more than a million pieces of parcel post and papers to the soldiers in France each month, and naturally there are complaints, especially in the first 60 days after arrival of the troops in the field. The extracts of letters I submit and the inspectors' reports show that these complaints arise only immediately after the arrival of each division sent abroad. Complaints about the mail first came from certain regiments of Regulars, the earliest troops sent across. The complaints from this source soon ceased. Next came complaints from certain units, such as Coast Artillery, Quartermaster Corps, and field clerks. Next, the railway engineers went across, and complaints were numerous and vigorous. Gradually they died out, and now we do not get one a week. Next, certain regiments from New England crossed to France, and numerous complaints followed. They have not yet ceased, as Representative ROGERS's letters show, but they are growing less. Since then the so-called rainbow division has gone to the front, and the Post Office Department is in the midst of complaints from that source, but it will pass over as soon as the division gets into a settled location and schooled in the handling of its own mail. Other divisions will go, and their mail communications will be temporarily disturbed. Does it not mean something that the Regulars are getting their mail, that the railway engineers no longer have reason to complain, and that the complaints of the later-arrived troops are already beginning to fall off?

Again, complaints about mail from the boys at the front to the dear ones at home are few and far between, less than a dozen a month, and these sometimes deal with the censorship delays, as is disclosed between the letter date within and the date of the postmark. The same force that is handling the mail to the soldiers is handling it from the soldiers. The difference is that the Post Office Department delivers the individual mail pieces into the hands of the addressees in the States, whereas it does not deliver mail to the addressees in France, but turns it over in bulk to the military authorities who distribute the mail to the individual soldiers. The mail passes out of the authority of the Post Office Department some time before it is delivered to the individual soldier. Is there no significance in the fact that the postal authorities in France who handle the mail going to shifting military units at the front is the same force that brings the mail back to the home folks without giving rise to complaints?

It is necessary to bear in mind certain facts to arrive at a conclusion about the mail service to the troops in France:

First. That the Post Office Department does not deliver the mail to the individual soldiers, but to the properly accredited military authorities in bulk just as it comes from the United States.

Second. That mail to the soldiers is not distributed in France, but is made up to companies in New York and Chicago, and these lead-sealed sacks are never opened after they leave New York until the military mail orderly opens them at the headquarters of the troops, when he delivers the letters, papers, or parcels to the individual soldiers. Only mail from the soldiers going to the United States is distributed by the postal clerks in France.

Third. That mail for the troops does not accumulate in any postal station, except such mail as the mail orderlies have not been able to deliver, or mail for such units as are on the move or whose location for war reasons the military authorities are not ready to disclose to the postal authorities.

Fourth. That mail for the troops is not sent to Paris except for such troops as may be located in Paris, but all mail for troops whose location has been furnished to the postal authorities by the commanding general of the lines of communication is sent from the port of debarkation direct to the points where the troops are located.

Fifth. That the mail is transmitted by every available steamer, by every available train in France, and should easily reach the regimental and company headquarters of the troops in from 15 to 30 days' time. The Post Office Department has no jurisdiction over the mail after the unopened sacks have been turned over to the military mail orderlies, but it is informed that the individual soldiers get their letters, parcels, etc., promptly, and that if there is any delay it is due to the fact that the soldier is not with his company at the time the mail arrives, or that the mail has been insufficiently or incorrectly addressed, or that the company itself shifted location shortly before the mail arrived.

The attached memorandum, with the excerpts from the inspectors' reports and from numerous letters of appreciation written by mail patrons who once bitterly complained about the service, may help to throw light on a subject so little understood.

Very sincerely, yours,

OTTO PRAEGER,
Second Assistant Postmaster General.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, February 7, 1918.

MEMORANDUM OF MAIL SERVICE TO FRANCE.

Many obstacles have been faced and overcome by the United States Postal Service in establishing and carrying on the present mail service to and from the American Army in France. This difficult war service has been operated to date as expeditiously and efficiently as could be expected under the circumstances. By adding rapidly to the force of postal experts in France and by bettering, as fast as possible, the system of distribution at our camps and bases in France, the military mail service has been steadily improving.

The charges of delay and nondelivery of mail of all classes from the United States to soldiers and officers of our forces abroad, made in the House of Representatives February 5 by the Hon. JOHN J. ROGERS, of Massachusetts, it is easily shown, relate to a comparatively small part of this military mail. Such delays as have occurred have been due in the main to conditions over which the post office has no control.

This statement is made in order that some of the difficult factors entering into this postal problem may be fully understood. It is true, as stated by the Postmaster General January 31 in answer to House resolution 232, that the time in transit of the bulk of the mail from the United States to units of our Army in France has been from 15 to 30 days. But it is likewise true that after passing into the hands of the military authorities the mail has to be distributed and often re-addressed and remailed before reaching the addressees, a process not in postal hands and one into which delays have at times entered. And it is also true that units have been frequently moved, and that considerable time has elapsed, amounting in instances to two weeks, before the United States Postal Service in France for war reasons has been advised of the new address of the regiment or unit thus moved.

It is admitted that mail from France is reaching addressees in this country as promptly as the present conditions of ocean transportation permit. This statement, therefore, deals only with the outgoing military mail.

Letters, papers, and parcels addressed to American soldiers and officers in France are made up at special terminals at Chicago and New York into direct sealed sacks and pouches addressed by companies to regiments or other units. These sealed pouches and sacks go direct by the first available dispatch from Atlantic ports to the port of debarkation in France, and thence direct to the postal station in France nearest the camp of the unit to which they are addressed. Each regiment or unit sends a military truck to this postal station for its mail. The mail is taken by this truck from the postal station to the military post office of each unit.

The bulk of the Army mail from the United States does not go through Paris but is taken direct, as stated above, from the port of debarkation either by military trains or regular train service to the postal station.

The opinion expressed by the Hon. JOHN F. MILLER, of Washington, while interrogating Mr. ROGERS in the course of the latter's speech, that this mail passes through Paris and is delayed by congestion there was evidently based upon Mr. MILLER's observation of our large postal establishment in Paris. It is outgoing mail originating in Paris which is "worked" in Paris; not the incoming. A portion of the mail from the United States, consisting principally of that for special units, such as the Red Cross, the Aviation Service, the Medical Corps, Signal Corps, etc., all the general mail returned as undeliverable from postal stations near the American camps does go to or through Paris. Officers and men of the special services are liable to frequent change of assignment in our own Armies and in the armies of our allies. They are subject to call to any part of the line, from Italy to Belgium. Mail for them can be better and more expeditiously handled at Paris. The undeliverable letters pass through Paris to a special American postal station, where it is turned over to the Army and given what corresponds to "directory service."

The specific complaints cited by Mr. ROGERS class into two groups. The one group has to do with mail to members of the Medical and Signal Corps; the other, with mail addressed to New England regiments, the One hundred and first and One hundred and second and to the Rainbow Division. The reasons why mail to members of the Medical and Signal Corps is especially subject to delay are stated above. Officers and men in those particular services are transferred frequently, and entire units are often moved hurriedly. When a unit is moved, and this applies to Infantry and Artillery also, the Postal Service may not send mail for the units so moved to the new addresses until authorized to do so by the military authorities, as some of these movements of units have been part of secret plans. At times the Post Office Department has been compelled to continue sending mail to the old addresses, although postal men know the unit in question had been moved.

The complaints as to letters, papers, and parcels, addressed to New England troops, but repeat the experience of the department. When an American division lands in France, it is likely to be moved several times before being permanently placed in some one sector of the front. During this interval of movement through some three or four camps, the regular and prompt delivery of mail from the United States is not always possible. This is true both because of postal and military reasons.

Reports to the department show that frequently quantities of mail are received in France addressed to units not yet there. The senders, of course, can not have exact knowledge as to when the addressees, whom they suppose, or are informed, have sailed for France, may be expected to land there. Such mail is held until our Postal Service in France is advised by the military authorities of the address of the unit in question.

In his speech, Mr. ROGERS did not specify, in any one instance, whether mail, of which delay was complained, was properly addressed. The quantity of mail of all classes to our Expeditionary Forces, upon which the full military address—that is, name, company, and regiment, and branch of the service—does not appear, unfortunately is very large. All such mail must go to Army headquarters for "directory service."

Without in any way reflecting upon the Army, it is true that the actual delivery of letters to the addressee in France is in the hands of Army orderlies designated by their units for this purpose, and that these orderlies are not always efficient until they have had a training in the work. There should not be confusion between American postal stations in France and American military post offices in the field. In the former mail is not allowed to be dead any length of time. If returned from Army field post offices to a postal station as undeliverable, or to be forwarded, mail is at once properly forwarded or sent to headquarters for directory service. Cases have been found by an American post-office inspector in which the orderlies at the field Army post offices did not handle their undeliverable mail as promptly as they should. It is proper to add here, also, that a number of highly trained postal men are in France and are endeavoring, to the best of their ability, to expedite the handling of mail, both at the postal stations in France and at the military post offices. There is no friction between the Army and the Postal Service; there is merely a condition to be met by cooperation and experience.

The Postmaster General stated on January 31, in response to House resolution 232, that letter mail clears entirely with every dispatch from New York, and that there has been very little delay at New York of parcel post or paper mail. That is true. It is also to be remembered, however, that vessels clearing from New York upon different dates are under special sailing orders and may arrive at the French port of destination on the same date. It is a fact that usually the mail arrives in France by a number of ships in lots varying from 5,000 to 15,000 bags and pouches. This presents a very large problem at the French port. It is a heavy undertaking to transfer these mails to trains, to route all of the bags and pouches properly, and to secure prompt dispatch. There have been difficulties in obtaining adequate labor and a sufficient number of hand and automobile trucks. The Post Office Department has done its utmost to surmount these difficulties and has succeeded beyond its expectations. Twenty-one thousands sacks of Christmas parcels for our soldiers abroad were dispatched from New York December 3 on one ship alone and arrived at a French port on December 20. All this mail was turned over from our 25 postal stations in France to the military authorities for delivery by December 24 and 25, as is shown by the following Associated Press dispatch from Paris on December 27:

FOUR CARS OF RELATED MAIL REACH TROOPS IN FRANCE.

"PARIS, DECEMBER 27.

"Four carloads of Christmas mail, which arrived at a French port from the United States, were forwarded to-day for delivery at the headquarters of the regimental units of the American expeditionary forces. The bulk of the Christmas mail, which consisted of 30,000

sacks and required 90 freight cars to move, was delivered at headquarters of the various units on or before Christmas Day, but a storm at sea delayed for three days the arrival of the mail sent forward to-day.

"Besides the mail delivered by the Army post office there were several carloads of large packages, each weighing more than 7 pounds, which were handled by the Quartermaster's Department."

The American Postal Service has been aided in reaching its high state of efficiency in the United States to-day by thorough consideration of complaints of inadequacy of service. When the complaints are found to be just, steps are taken to find remedies. Our present service in France is no exception. All complaints received are given thorough study by the proper postal officials. Following is a summarization of complaints which were referred to a post-office inspector assigned to the United States Army Postal Service. The text of the inspector's reports is given:

Subject: United States Army Postal Service in France. Complaints against the service.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR, ——— DIVISION,
Paris, France, December 4, 1917.

CHIEF INSPECTOR, Washington, D. C.:

In further reference to your letters of September 28 and October 2, transmitting a number of complaints relative to the alleged nonreceipt by addressees with the forces in France of letter and parcel mail, I have to submit herewith the correspondence in 18 of these cases which have been investigated by me. Twelve cases are still on hand, the answers to which have not been received, although ample time has elapsed. A subsequent report will be rendered on the cases still pending.

This report should be handed to the Second Assistant for his personal information. The results of the investigation show hardly without an exception that all mail has reached the addressees, and that the complaints are due wholly to ignorance of the prevailing conditions of slow transportation across the Atlantic and impatience on the part of senders and addressees. It is hoped that when the general condition of slow transportation is better understood throughout the United States that such complaints will cease or that the addressees will refrain from making a complaint until sufficient time has elapsed.

It is unnecessary to enter into detail in this report concerning each individual case, the file submitted as an exhibit fully explaining each complaint. The names and general details of each case are submitted, however, merely as a matter of record. A full idea of the complaint, however, will be obtained by reading each case. I suggest that the files in each case be retained at the department, and that if correspondence be had with the complainants that the result of the investigation be communicated only. This is suggested in order that the department may retain and be in possession of the files if needed at a later date for any purpose.

No. 1. Helmer J. Johnson, Sixteenth Infantry, wrote his mother that he was sending her money every month. His mother reported through Congressman J. H. DAVIDSON that she had never received any. Complaint was made as to the loss of mail, but investigation shows that Johnson never sent any money by mail, but made an allotment through the Army paymaster, which was handled in an entirely different manner.

No. 2. Mr. W. B. Clarkson, of San Antonio, makes complaint that he had sent his son, Lieut. W. P. Clarkson, of the Twenty-sixth Infantry, 10 parcels of cigarettes, and that his son reported he had received none of them. Investigation shows he had received to date eight packages of cigarettes and all were in good condition, and that he is now receiving all his mail. No reason to believe the other two parcels reported sent were lost, as they will be received in due time.

No. 3. Dr. V. J. Irwin, of Springfield, Mass., complains that his son, Corpl. Charles R. Irwin, of the Twenty-sixth Infantry, had not received any mail from home. The addressee advises that he received nine letters recently. He did not say how many he received before. No reason to believe any of his mail is lost.

No. 4. Mrs. J. McCurdy, of Chicago, complains that she has written to Pvt. H. E. McCurdy, of the Seventeenth Company, Fifth Regiment Marines, but he has received none of her letters. Pvt. McCurdy advises "I have every reason to believe I have received all mail sent me." No mail lost in this case.

No. 5. Frank R. Davies, of Sheepshead Bay, N. Y., complains that he has written to Pvt. Lester S. Davies, of the Quartermaster Department, but that the addressee has received none of his letters. Pvt. Davies advises me that he has received all of his letters up to date.

No. 6. Mrs. Annie J. Wharton, of Homewood, Ill., complains that she has written numerous letters to Lieut. James F. Wharton, Military Reserve Corps, who advises he has received none of her letters. Lieut. Wharton advises me that he has received 19 letters from her, and gives a list of them with dates. No delay and no loss in this case.

No. 7. Miss Kathryn M. Kehoe, of Brooklyn, N. Y., complains, September 12, that she has received only two letters from Pvt. John Addy, of the Eleventh Engineers, who left New York July 14. She hardly had time to receive more in that short time, as letters usually take 30 days. Addy says he has word from Miss Kehoe that she has received 6 of his letters. He says he received 24 from her. No loss and no reason for complaint.

No. 8. Miss M. Currier, of Haverhill, Mass., makes complaint that she has written to Patrick J. Lucey, of Company B, Fourteenth Engineers, and that he has received none of her letters. Lucey advises that he has received all letters and parcels from her and that none are lost.

No. 9. Miss Vermita Eves, of St. Louis, complains that Edgar Dennison, Twelfth Engineers, left the United States on July 26 and that by September 8 (43 days) she had heard from him only once. Some transports take 22 days to cross. She is therefore getting good service if she heard from him that quick, and should commend the postal department rather than enter a complaint. Edgar Dennison says he has received all letters from her. No loss and no reason for complaint.

No. 10. Mary E. Boyle, of Flushing, N. Y., makes complaint, under date of September 24, that she has been writing to Sergt. Thomas P. Connors, Eleventh Engineers, and has not received a reply. I communicated with Connors and he states he received a letter from Mary E. Boyle dated September 21, in which she stated she had received letters Nos. 1 and 2 from him. The complainant has, therefore, misrepresented the facts in her complaint. (See correspondence.)

No. 11. Mr. Frank Mahnke, of Brooklyn, N. Y., complains that he has written to his son, Pvt. W. Mahnke, Quartermaster's Department, but his son advises him that he has received no letters from home. Pvt. Mahnke advises me he has received three letters from home, one taking 20 and the other 30 days to reach him. He is getting good service, and there is no basis for complaint.

No. 12. Bernard White, of Watseka, Ill., complains that he has written to Irenus J. Feffer, of the Sixteenth Infantry, but that Feffer has not received his letters. Feffer advises he has received two letters from White recently.

No. 13. Mrs. D. B. Inman, of Havre de Grace, Md., complains that her husband, D. B. Inman, of the Medical Supply Depot, has received but one letter from her. Inman states his letters have been coming along very well during the past six weeks. One letter he received in 10 days and another in 34 days. The latter was due to infrequent sailings, the same thing happening to mail for postal headquarters and others. No mail lost and no basis for complaint.

No. 14. The complaint of Mrs. Virginia Neal, Tucson, Ariz., has no bearing on the French service and should be investigated at Tucson, Ariz.

No. 15. R. D. Rhodes, of Newcastle, Pa., complains that some music sent him from France by Harvey Bush, Fifth Engineer Corps, not received. Our records show no Fifth Engineers in France. We have about 34 sacks of mail awaiting this regiment, which has been held some time. Correspond with R. D. Rhodes and ask him where Harvey Bush is and with what outfit.

No. 16. E. D. Wolsard, of Pittston, Pa., complains he has not heard from his son in France. He does not know whether his son has written or not, but just thinks so. He does not give the name of his son, so nothing can be done here in France. I suggest writing to him from the department and asking him if he has heard.

No. 17. Representative Steenerson complains that Mrs. Harry E. Gladman, Washington, D. C., has not heard from J. L. Stoddard, of United States Army, Base Hospital 10, who advises others he has written her. He advises me he has written her three letters. I suggest investigation at Washington to see if she has not received these letters by now.

No. 18. Mrs. J. W. Fuller, of San Antonio, Tex., complains that letters and parcels sent to Lyda C. King, a nurse in Hospital 2, France, have not been received. Lyda C. King states she has received two letters and two parcels. It is not stated how many letters were written, so there is no way to tell here if any were lost.

When answers have been received to the other few complaints on hand a supplementary report will be submitted, but it is believed some will not answer, as they are receiving their mail and pay no further attention to the investigation.

(Signed) W. A. KENYON,

Post Office Inspector, U. S. Army Postal Service, France.

Eighteen complaints and correspondence submitted herewith.

PARIS, FRANCE, January 17, 1918.

CHIEF INSPECTOR,
Washington, D. C.:

I have to submit herewith a supplementary report to that submitted December 4, 1917, relating to complaints as to the alleged nonreceipt by addressees with the troops in France of letters and parcels. This report covers investigation in 18 separate cases. Numerous cases are still on hand, the answers to which have not been received. A subsequent report will be rendered covering cases still outstanding.

The investigation in the 18 cases submitted herewith shows without a single exception that all mail has been received by addressees. The complaints are due wholly to lack of knowledge of prevailing conditions or impatience on the part of the complainants.

The complete file is submitted in each case. In this report, however, only a general outline is given in each instance. I suggest that the files be retained at the department, so that we will be in possession of all the facts if needed at a later date for any purpose. If correspondence be had with the complainants, the result of the investigation only should be communicated.

No. 1. Gall & Lembke, New York City, made a complaint on Form 1510 that they mailed a parcel containing gold-filled spectacles, valued at \$16.50, to Capt. E. R. McFarland, U. S. R., Signal Corps, France, but that he reports not having received them. Inquiry shows that Capt. McFarland has received the glasses in good condition. No loss.

No. 2. Myrtle Buzan, of Pendleton, Oreg., complains she has written twice each week to Private Buzan, Company F, Eighteenth Railway Engineers, France, but that he reports having received only two letters from her. He states that up to the present time he has received all of his mail.

No. 3. Mr. A. W. Hurley, Pawhuska, Okla., complains that if the 40 or 50 letters that he has written Capt. Thomas D. Hurley, United States Army Ambulance Corps, he, Capt. Hurley, has received none of them. Addressee states that he has received so far 29 letters from members of his family. No doubt in due time he will receive all the mail sent him.

No. 4. John L. Fitzgerald, Pittsfield, Mass., complains that he has sent a parcel containing miscellaneous articles to Corp. W. F. Fitzgerald, Company D, Fourteenth Railway Engineers, but that the addressee reports that he received only the razor and strop, with many articles missing. Addressee advises that the parcel was received in perfect condition with no loss. Absolutely no loss in this case.

No. 5. M. F. Kane, Shamokin, Pa., complains that he has written six letters and his friends nine letters to M. J. Kane, United States Army Ambulance Corps, Section 9, France, who reports having received none of them. Addressee states that he has received so far five letters from his father and five from his friends. No doubt he will receive all in due time. He complained of slow delivery of his mail upon first arriving in France. This delay is due, without doubt, to the fact that the United States Army ambulance service with the French and British have frequently had the numbers changed; also that all of this mail is handled by the American field office. Conditions in the mail room of the American field service in the early days of the war were not favorable, which no doubt accounts for the delay in the receipt of mail.

No. 6. Mrs. John S. Boyd, Pittsburgh, Pa., complains that John S. Boyd, Fifteenth United States Engineers, has failed to receive \$10 in money which was sent him and also no packages of tobacco which have been sent him. The addressee advises that he has received the \$10 and also all parcels sent to him.

No. 7. William Nash, Chicago, Ill., complains that he has sent W. E. Nash, section 58, United States Army Aviation Service, about one dozen packages and many letters, of which but one letter has been received. The addressee advises that the delay to his mail was due to his having been changed from section 10 to section 58, but that he is now receiving his letters regularly, and that he has received many parcels. He complains, however, that he has not yet received all the parcels which he believes have been sent him. These parcels will no doubt reach him in due time.

No. 8. Mrs. W. C. Strange, Columbia, S. C., complains that she has written on several occasions since September 1 to her husband, Capt. Willis C. Strange, quartermaster, United States Reserves, and that he has received no letters from her. Investigation develops that Capt. Strange has received 25 letters. He states that several letters are at present outstanding, according to numbers. This is not unusual, as some mails reach France earlier than those previously dispatched.

No. 9. Mr. John A. Loughenry, St. Claire, Pa., complains that John J. Loughenry, Company E, Twenty-sixth Infantry, has failed to get papers and packages sent him. The addressee states that he has received three packages and one paper since being in France. Apparently some parcels are still outstanding.

No. 10. Mr. Davis Brown, Albany, Ga., complains that his son, Lieut. Jerome H. Brown, Company L, Twenty-eighth Infantry, has failed to receive letters written to him. Lieut. Brown states that he is receiving his mail regularly now, but that packages mailed on October 19 and November 17 have not arrived. No doubt Lieut. Brown will receive packages in due time.

No. 11. Mr. A. C. Baker, New York, complains that his son, Pvt. Baker, Company F, Nineteenth Engineers, has failed to receive any letters or parcels sent him from home. Pvt. Baker states that he has received all mail from home, including the packages, which is in all about 50 letters and 5 or 6 packages, and that he has written his folks every time he has received mail.

No. 12. Miss Marion Baum, of Elizabeth, N. J., complains that she has written many letters and sent one package to Pvt. Clayton Lockwood, First Trench Mortar Battery, and that none of her letters or the package has been received by him. Lockwood states that he has received about 15 letters and 2 packages from her.

No. 13. Mrs. S. L. Littlefield, of Lankershin, Cal., complains she has frequently written Leon M. Littlefield, Headquarters Divisional Supply Company, and that he has received one letter from her. He replies that he has received at least 12 or 14 letters and one package of tobacco and has answered every letter. No loss.

No. 14. Mr. L. L. Rea, Auburn, N. Y., complains that he writes Corp. L. Earle Rea, Seventeenth Company, Fifth Marines, and that no letters have been received by the addressee. Corp. Rea advises that during the last few months his mail has been coming regularly, and that he has received all that was coming to him.

No. 15. The family of Lieut. Mettis, Ordnance Department, United States Reserves, complains from Severeville, N. J., that they have written him many letters, including one registered, and that none of them has been received by him. Addressee advises that he has received to present date 14 letters, including the registered. He also expressed his opinion that delay to mail is not due to the post office in France. This matter has been taken up in France with the Army headquarters.

No. 16. Mrs. S. W. Musselman, of Perkasi, Pa., complains that Paul F. Musselman, formerly assigned to Medical Department, Casual Seventh Regiment, Coast Artillery, has not received any mail whatsoever. Paul Musselman advises that he is now attached to the Sixteenth Infantry, and that he has received all of his letters to date. One package of mail of November 1 he claimed he has not received, but this package was not due in France yet, as ships have just lately arrived. There is no just cause for complaint.

No. 17. William Luers, Cincinnati, Ohio, complains letters have been sent every week to John M. Luers, Company D, Sixteenth Railway Engineers, and that none of them have been received by the addressee. Addressee states that all of his mail is now being delivered promptly.

No. 18. Mrs. S. S. Weidmeyer, of Brooklyn, N. Y., complains that she has sent about 24 letters, cigarettes, and candy to Sergt. Harry C. Weidmeyer, Battery E, Seventh Field Artillery, but that he has received none of them. Harry C. Weidmeyer advises that he has received to date 12 letters and one package. He gives his address as Battery B, while the complainant has been addressing his mail to Battery E, which no doubt accounts for loss of some of the letters. The failure to deliver is therefore not due to delinquency on the part of the Postal Service, but to failure to properly address the mail.

(Signed) W. A. KENYON,
Post Office Inspector,
United States Army Postal Service.

The above was not prepared with any thought of its publication. These reports in the above circumstances tend to show that in by far the majority of cases mail of all classes is reaching the addressees in France as promptly as could be expected.

Other such reports received by the department state that "a large number of letters are returned from the chief surgeon's office, the chief quartermaster, the chief signal officer, and other such staff corps, whose men are detached and located all over France"; that "the French railroad lines are taxed to capacity and their own soldiers' mail is sent by military freight trains"; and that most of the "complaints are due wholly to ignorance on the part of the complainants as to the conditions of transportation."

Since American soldiers went to France more than 100,000 bags and pouches of mail have been dispatched to them and safely landed in France without the loss of a bag or pouch. Considering the enormous quantity, bulk, and weight of this mail, complaints of loss, damage, and delay have been surprisingly few. It is to be remembered that this statement deals only with the relatively small quantity of which complaint has been made. Some delay and possibly some loss, as has been shown, is inevitable under the circumstances.

The complaints of poor service are given prominence, whereas the reports of good service do not reach the public. The department could array an enormous bulk of testimony from our military forces in France showing their satisfaction with the service. As has been stated, complaints are frequent upon the arrival of troops in France, but in very many cases, sometimes a few days after the complaints were written, the complainants write again to thank the Post Office Department and to say that their correspondents were receiving their mail, as is shown by the following synopsis of letters:

EXTRACTS FROM COMPLAINTS RECEIVED FROM PERSONS IN THIS COUNTRY AS TO THE NONRECEIPT OF MAIL BY MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCES AND EXTRACTS FROM SUBSEQUENT LETTERS ADVISING THAT MAIL IS BEING RECEIVED.

August 27, 1917, Mrs. Mary Kaplan, 212 West One hundred and eleventh Street, New York City, advised that her son, David Kaplan, arrived in France July 8 for service with the Quartermaster Department; that a number of letters had been written to him, but that in a letter from him dated August 5 he stated that he had not received a single letter from home.

September 7, 1917, Mrs. Kaplan again wrote the department advising that since her former letter, "my son has acknowledged letters received from home."

August 31, 1917, the postmaster at Chicago wrote that Mr. W. P. Quinby, 69 West Washington Street, Chicago, the father of Sergt. William Quinby, of the Quartermaster Corps, desired information as to why letters addressed to his son could not be delivered, and inclosed envelopes returned to the father.

November 7, 1917, Mr. Quinby wrote the postmaster at Chicago that it appeared there was another Sergt. William Quinby in Paris, to whom his son's letters had been delivered; that when this William Quinby learned his son's address he turned the letters over to him, and "since that time there has been no trouble."

September 7, 1917, Rev. Charles Trowbridge, 402 Cattell Street, Easton, Pa., advised that up to August 10 his son had received only 10 of 24 letters that had been mailed to him and that all mail had been addressed in the same way.

September 30, 1917, Mr. Trowbridge again wrote the department stating "word has been received to-day from my son and he informs me that my letters to him are coming regularly, or were up to September 8, the date of his last letter to me."

September 24, 1917, Mary E. Boyle, Flushing, N. Y., advised that Sergt. Thomas P. Connors, Company A, Eleventh Railway Engineers, United States Army, American Expeditionary Forces, was not receiving mail.

October 5, 1917, Miss Boyle advised that "since writing you I have received word that Sergt. Connors received on September 4 a letter mailed from Flushing to him on August 11."

September 27, 1917, D. S. Middleton, Jeffersonville, Pa., advised that his son had been in France since June 16; that on the 15th of July candy was sent him and a week later more candy and razor blades, addressed as he advised; that these things had not been received.

October 12, 1917, Mr. Middleton advised that in a letter from his son dated September 16 he stated that he received the box of candy sent him July 15 and the razor blades (Sept. 14) sent him on August 16, but not the candy sent him on the same day. "I guess it takes a little longer to censor candy than it does razor blades."

September 28, 1917, V. J. Irwin, 351 Main Street, Springfield, Mass., advised of the nonreceipt of mail by his son with the American expeditionary forces.

November 3, 1917, Mr. Irwin advised the department that he had received a letter from his son stating that he received within three days four of the letters sent to him. The reason for the delay was that the regiment and company were omitted from some of the addresses, the censor having erased both on the first letter sent.

October 3, 1917, a telegram was received from John E. Frenning, Boston, Mass., advising that since July 1 at different times he had sent approximately 30 packages by parcel post to Jack and Alfred Frenning, also Oliver Beebe, care of 21 Rue Raynouard, Paris, from Belmont and Boston, Mass., containing over \$150 worth of clothing, but that up to September 4 none had been received.

October 22, 1917, Mr. Frenning advised, "Received word last week from our two sons that they have received much of the parcel-post matter that was sent to them last July."

October 4, 1917, Mrs. John J. Fowler, Grahamles, Spring Lake, N. J., advised that mail for her son, "Sergt. John C. Fowler," addressed "Headquarters Company, Motor Truck Group, American Expeditionary Forces," was not being received.

October 17, 1917, Mrs. Fowler advised the department: "Thank you so much for your information regarding mail and parcel-post matter for the boys in France. I have the extreme pleasure of letting you know that this morning I was the happy recipient of a letter from my son saying that mail had been received all O. K. Thanking you for your interest and lovely letter."

October 6, 1917, Mr. Armstrong, of Armstrong & Demarest, Lafayette, N. J., wrote regarding the nonreceipt of mail by his son, O. P. Armstrong, addressed "Care American Red Cross Ambulance, 7 Rue Francois Premier, S. S. U. 62, Paris, France."

October 18, 1917, Mr. Armstrong advised that his son had received the first two packages via parcel post.

October 13, 1917, W. John Crawford, Clifton Heights, Pa., advised that mail for his son, with the Seventh Field Artillery as a first lieutenant, Officers' Reserve Corps, was not being received. "I receive his mail very regularly, but he had not received any mail on the 24th of September."

October 22, 1917, Mr. Crawford advised that on the 29th of September his son received five letters, dated from September 2 to 12. "My last letter from him came through in 16 days."

October 22, 1917, L. F. Clark, care Aetna Life Insurance Co., Cincinnati, Ohio, advised that his father, Mr. John Clark, the postal agent in France, advised that he had received no word from home since his arrival in France.

November 22, 1917, Mr. Clark advised that "since receiving the information from you we have heard from him, and find that he is getting all the packages and letters regularly."

November 5, 1917, Justice Walter I. McCoy, District of Columbia Supreme Court, submitted to the department copies of letters written by him to the Secretary of War with reference to the nonreceipt of mail by his son, George B. McCoy, first lieutenant, Infantry, Officers' Reserve Corps, A. E. F. (par. B. C. M., Paris). Up to October 17 he had not received one letter from his family.

November 13, 1917, Justice McCoy advised that "we had a letter from my son this morning, dated October 22, saying that he had received several letters from Mrs. McCoy and myself and from others, the latest of which was dated September 27. I wish to thank you again for your attention to the matter."

November 12, 1917, the postmaster at Chicago submitted a letter from Arthur M. Heath, 1825 Seward Street, Chicago, advising that since August 29 at least 50 letters and 4 packages had been addressed to his son, "Lieut. Monroe Heath, unassigned, United States Army, Infantry

United States Reserves, American Expeditionary Forces," and that under date of October 15 his son advised that he had not received any mail. In this letter he gave another address, "Infantry, United States Reserves, American Expeditionary Forces, B. C. M., Paris France." Request was made that attention be given the matter.

November 22, 1917, Mr. Heath advised "I wish to thank you * * * and to advise that we have received letters from our son, in which he states that he is now receiving mail, and at the time of writing had had a number of letters."

November 16, 1917, Hilton N. Brown, sr., care Indianapolis News, Indianapolis, Ind., advised: "We have utterly failed to reach by mail my son, Second Lieut. Hilton N. Brown, unattached, Field Artillery, United States Reserves, American Expeditionary Forces, via New York City." We have had letters from him dated as late as October 27, and up to that time he had not heard a word from this country since he sailed about the 1st of September. When we began to hear from him he advised us to send mail in care of "Field Artillery School of Instruction, American Expeditionary Forces," and packages were addressed in that manner.

December 1 Mr. Brown advises by telegraph: "My son is now beginning to receive letters, indicating communication lines are open. Thanks."

November 12, 1917, Miss Nettie White, 286 K Street, South Boston, Mass., advised of the nonreceipt of mail sent to Mr. Charles E. Ryan, Company B, One hundred and first Massachusetts Infantry, American Expeditionary Forces.

November 23, 1917, Miss White advised "Mr. Ryan has received some of my letters. Will receive all letters, I hope."

November 13, 1917, L. L. Rea, Auburn, N. Y., advised that in a letter dated October 27 from his son, Corpl. L. Earl Rea, Seventeenth Company, Infantry Battalion, Fifth Regiment, United States Marine Corps, he advised that he had not had a letter in six weeks. "We write him every week and sometimes several letters. We have sent him several packages and he has received but one."

November 30, 1917, Mr. Rea advised: "Am pleased to report that my son has advised that he has received a number of letters all in a bunch, and that he felt like a new man. I wish to thank you for your very kind letter to me. The spirit which ran through the letter and the information was most helpful to us all."

October 15, 1917, Mrs. Hedie MacDonald, Box 406, Marfa, Tex., advised that her husband, Pvt. John W. MacDonald, Quartermaster Corps, left for France on July 20, and that he was not receiving her letters.

October —, 1917, Mrs. MacDonald advised: "The letters to which I referred in my former letter have part been received so far."

November 1, 1917, David Brown, Albany, Ga., advised that his son, Lieut. Jerome H. Brown, Infantry Section, Officers' Reserve Corps, United States Army, Post-Office Box 703, American Expeditionary Force, reported that he had not received any letters from home, although he sailed from New York on September 7. "In our last letter received from him to-day he states that only one letter has been received at the training school which he is attending."

December 1 (?), 1917, Mr. Brown advises that some of the mail sent his son in September has been received, "and I trust, with your co-operation, that all of the mail will be forwarded to him promptly."

November 21, 1917, Mrs. George Brown, Box 267, Sutherland Springs, Tex., advised of the nonreceipt of mail addressed as follows: "Mr. Edwin Willingham, Headquarters Company 28, United States Infantry, American Forces, France."

December 14, 1917, Mrs. Brown advised: "Mr. Willingham has received the box you were having looked into which was sent September 14. He received it about the 19th of November."

December 1, 1917, Representative H. J. STEELE, of Pennsylvania, advised that Daniel McCarthy, of Easton, Pa., had informed him that his son, Corpl. Daniel McCarthy, Battery H, Sixth Regiment, Coast Artillery Guards, American Expeditionary Forces, had not received any of the mail sent him from home or from his friends in Easton.

December 5, 1917, Representative STEELE transmits a letter from Mr. McCarthy, in which he says that word has just been received from his son advising that he has received some of his mail.

November 22, 1917, the War Department transmitted a letter from Mrs. Marcus G. Evans, 953 Bryden Road, Columbus, Ohio, advising that about 20 boxes had been sent to her son, who landed in France August 20, also many letters; none received.

Later Mrs. Evans advised: "I wish to tell you how much I appreciate your kindness. I received a letter last week from my son, saying that the day before he wrote (November 6) he received five packages and three letters from me. I hope, through your efforts, he will receive the rest."

December 7, 1917, Mr. Rudolph Forster, The White House, advised that a friend of his had written that mail addressed to his son, J. W. McGrath, jr., Company E, One hundred and first Regiment Infantry, Twenty-sixth Division, American Expeditionary Forces, was not being received. The first package was mailed on September 27, and this had not reached him up to the 10th or 15th of November.

December 17, 1917, Mr. Forster quotes a letter from the friend dated December 14: "I want to say that I have just received word from the boy in France, and he has received two or three packages which I mailed him. I think that perhaps the others will reach him later."

December 6, 1917, F. A. M. Burrell, 1409 Albemarle Road, Brooklyn, N. Y., advised that his son, Harold A. Burrell, care Y. M. C. A., 31 Avenue Montaigne, Paris, was not receiving his mail.

December 12, 1917, Mr. Burrell advised, "I have just heard that my son, H. A. Burrell received the first package sent him on November 20. It was mailed in New York September 15."

December 21, 1917, Mr. Burrell advised that packages of tobacco and cigarettes sent to his brother, Charles S. Burrell, Sixth Battalion Canadian Troops, France, which he thought lost were beginning to arrive, and "I am finding the facts mentioned in your printed circular of November 27 are correct."

December 5, 1917, Charles V. Hilding, 307 Fourth National Bank, Grand Rapids, Mich., advised that mail for his brother, Pvt. Axel E. Hilding, Company C, Sixteenth Engineers Regiment, American Expeditionary Forces, was not being received.

December 13, 1917, Mr. Hilding advised, "I am very glad to advise you that day before yesterday I received a letter from my brother informing me that he had received some mail and had also received one package of tobacco. While there has been considerable delay, yet it is pleasing to know that the matters finally appear to be reaching destination. Thanking you for your prompt attention."

November 23, 1917, the secretary to the governor of Massachusetts forwarded a communication from Miss Lillie Copeland, 74 Homer Street, East Boston, Mass., advising that her brother, Charles William Copeland, sailed for France the middle of September, that she had been writing to him about three times a week since he left, but that in his last letter, received November 20, he advised that he had received no mail since he left New York.

December 10, 1917, Miss Copeland advised: "I am pleased to inform you that I received a letter this morning from my brother, Sergt. Charles W. Copeland, Quartermaster Enlisted Reserve Corps, that he had received a letter from me which I sent in September. * * * With many thanks for your trouble."

November 14, 1917, A. C. Barker, 607 White Building, Buffalo, N. Y., advised that his son, a private in Company F, Nineteenth Regiment Engineers (Railway), with the American Expeditionary Forces, is not receiving his mail. "I have written him regularly every week since they sailed in August and sent him tobacco and parcel post for four consecutive weeks starting the first week in September, and his last letter, dated October 23, does not acknowledge the receipt of them, and he states he has not received same or word from us for two weeks."

November 28, 1917, Mr. Barker writes: "I humbly have to state that since writing you that communication I have received several communications from my son acknowledging several of our letters and parcel-post packages sent him the latter part of September."

November 13, 1917, the postmaster at Belton, Tex., advised that a patron of the office, Mrs. Harry O. Ware, advised that since September 8 she had been mailing letters regularly addressed to Harry Otis Ware, second lieutenant, Cavalry, United States Reserves, and that he had never received any of her letters.

December 7, 1917, the postmaster writes, "I desire to state that Mrs. Ware has informed me that such mail is now being delivered."

November 21, 1917, Mrs. Nora Forbes, Hoboken, N. J., advised that her son, Pvt. George S. Forbes, Headquarters Troop, First Expeditionary Division, A. E. F. (later Company A, Twenty-eighth Infantry, A. E. F.), arrived in France August 22 and advised her October 23 that he had received no word from her. She wrote three times a week and sent papers and parcel-post packages, but received no reply.

December 10, 1917, Mrs. Forbes advised: "I received a letter to-day from my son, and he wrote it November 19. He was delighted in getting a few of the first letters and papers from me, written in September. I feel confident that he will send us word of receiving the balance."

November 21, 1917, Mrs. J. Knox, 88 Lynch Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., advised: "My husband is a lieutenant in the Cavalry division and has been on the other side since September 8, and I have sent him at least 14 letters. He writes and says that he has not received any mail from me since he has been there," a letter having been received that day.

December 1, 1917, Mrs. Knox advised: "I have received a letter from my husband stating that he has received one of my letters."

September 14, 1917, C. Henry Stinson, 317 Swede Street, Norristown, Pa., advised that letters and parcel post addressed to his son, Robert Stinson, 21 Rue Raynouard, Passy, Paris, France, care of American Field Service, were not being received; also that the same condition applied with reference to mail for Francis Harley Sheatz, secretary Groupe Americaine, T. M. 526, Peleton C. Conveys Autos, par B. C. M., Paris. A list of articles sent to Mr. Stinson was later provided.

October 25, 1917, Mr. Stinson advised: "I would say that my son has received two packages of tobacco and one of candy at his last writing, October 3. Two of them were gotten at the Rue Raynouard by one of his friends who went there and hunted through a large amount of mail matter that was lying there undelivered."

October 31, 1917, Mr. Stinson also advised: "The letters to my son and all first-class mail matter has been received by him, comparatively speaking, with regularity."

December 3, 1917, B. F. Bourne, Cleveland, Ohio, advised that his daughter and two other young ladies, whose husbands are Volunteer officers in Europe, had been receiving cables and letters from their husbands, but that no letters or cables had been received by their husbands, although they landed on the other side at least a month ago, or longer.

December 11, 1917, Mr. Bourne writes: "I beg to advise that on yesterday my daughter received a cable from her husband to the effect that he had just received a large number of our letters, indicating that the channels necessary to secure delivery of mail from this country to such officers are now open. * * * I take this occasion to thank you for the kind interest which you have shown in my request."

December 9, 1917, A. G. Lano, Annandale, Minn., advised that in a letter from his son, Sergt. Arthur R. Lano, Thirty-first Aero Squadron, American Expeditionary Forces, dated November 14, he advised that he had received no mail from home. "He has been in France since September 14, 1917."

December 17, 1917, Mr. Lano wrote: "I was to-day advised by my son that he has received his mail on November 23 and 24. * * * I take great pleasure in thanking you for the interest you have taken in this matter."

November 27, 1917, Postmaster Selph, of St. Louis, Mo., forwarded a letter from J. Carr Gamble, Third National Bank Building, St. Louis, Mo., advising that mail for his brother, Lieut. Clark R. Gamble, American Officers' Infantry School, A. E. F., France, was not being received, probably because such matter had omitted that part of the address, "American Officers' Infantry School."

December 17, 1917, Mr. Gamble advised: "I am pleased to inform you that my brother has received mail which was sent to him. His first letter was received November 25 and was mailed from St. Louis on October 3."

December 22, 1917, Representative KENNEDY, of Rhode Island, advised that Mr. C. D. McDermott, of Georgiaville, R. I., had complained to him concerning the nondelivery of mail to his son; that since October 29 he had written his son every week and had sent money, tobacco, and clothing, and that the son, Pvt. Charles D. McDermott, Company A, One hundred and first Regiment, United States Engineer Corps, had not received even a letter.

December 31, 1917, Representative KENNEDY, of Rhode Island, writes: "It gives me pleasure to inform you that Pvt. McDermott has received the first letter sent him by his parents. Word to this effect has been received by his father."

December 21, 1917, Mr. John Loughenry, Box 233, St. Clair, Pa., wrote concerning the nonreceipt of mail addressed to John J. Loughenry, Company C, Twenty-sixth United States Infantry, American Expeditionary Force, Paris; that he received his letters but not packages.

December, 1917, Mr. Loughenry advised that he had just received word from his son that he had received two of the five packages.

December 10, 1917, M. E. Golding, East Liverpool, Ohio, wrote that mail for his son, with the American Field Ambulance Service, in France, was not being received; that in a letter dated November 10, received December 9, he advised that he had received no money, although the father had sent several remittances.

December 27, 1917, Mr. Golding advised that he had word from his son stating that most of the mail complained about as being long overdue, some containing drafts, others having essential comforts, had most of it reached him. "Excepting some nonessentials, I think all mail has been delivered. I ought to say that by 'nonessentials' candles and suchlike are meant. And now his mother and I want to thank you for your prompt assistance and the comfort of your correspondence."

November, 1917, Miss Maude Jenkins, Ewing, Ind., wrote that Clifford V. Boofor, Twenty-ninth Aero Squadron, Signal Service Corps, Aviation Section, American Expeditionary Forces, was not receiving mail addressed by her to him.

December 20, 1917, Miss Jenkins advised that Mr. Boofor had received one letter from her.

December 17, 1917, Mrs. J. F. Lange, Harrison, N. Y., advised that mail addressed to her son, Pvt. John F. Lange, jr. (packages, papers, and magazines), was not being received.

December 27, 1917, Mrs. Lange advised that she had that morning received word that her son had received three of her letters, written early in October, and one package received December 5.

October 16, 1917, William T. Jennings, chairman committee on public safety, Harrisburg, Pa., advised as to the general unsatisfactory condition of mail service for his son who went to France from England about August 2; that no newspapers, which had been sent him regularly from June 28, had been received.

The case was put into the hands of a post-office inspector for investigation, who makes report on December 20, stating in part as follows: "On the 5th instant I again saw Mr. Jennings, when he informed me that he had recently heard from his son, who stated that a quantity of delayed mail had just been received by him, indicating that it had been accumulating at some point prior to receipt by the addressee."

November 15, 1917, Dr. D. L. Grayson, James Building, Chattanooga, Tenn., wrote concerning the nonreceipt of mail addressed to his son, Lieut. C. B. Grayson. He left this country somewhere in the neighborhood of September 8, "and I think you will agree with me that from September 8 to October 25 is such a delay in the delivery of mail as should be given prompt attention. * * * I was yesterday in receipt of two letters from him, one dated October 16 and the other October 25. In the first letter he distinctly stated that he had received nothing of any source in this country whatever. His letter of October 25 makes no reference to the receipt of any mail." A letter dated December 13, from Mr. Grayson, indicates frequent changes in his son's address.

December 21, 1917, Dr. Grayson writes: "I beg to advise that in a letter received, dated November 25, from my son, he advises that he has begun to receive his mail, having on that date received three letters from us. He is greatly elated in consequence. Thanking you very much for the interest you have taken in this matter and assuring you of my appreciation thereof."

November 23, 1917, Mr. T. J. O'Donnell, 822 Ernest & Grammer Building, Denver, Colo., advised of the nonreceipt of newspapers addressed as follows: "Capt. Ottomar O'Donnell, Fifth Field Artillery, American Expeditionary Force." A box of confections mailed early in September had not been received when he wrote.

December 19, 1917, Mr. O'Donnell writes, "I am to-day in receipt of a letter from Capt. O'Donnell, dated November 25, in which he acknowledges receipt 'during the last week' of papers, packages, and letters sent between September 29 and October 27."

December 22, 1917, Mr. O'Donnell advised that in a letter dated November 16 from his son he acknowledged receipt of cigarettes, candy, and papers. "I assume now that conditions are adjusting themselves."

December —, 1917, Mrs. Rollin M. Thomas, Klemme, Iowa, advised that packages for her husband, Second Lieut. Rollin M. Thomas, V. O. R. C., Base Section No. 1, A. E. F., France, were not being received, although he had received most of the letters.

December 22, 1917, Mrs. Thomas advised, "Have just received word that the most important packages have reached Lieut. Thomas."

December 9, 1917, Mrs. E. G. Tomlinson, Fort Howard, advised that on September 28 she sent her husband, Lieut. E. G. Tomlinson, First Division Ammunition Train, Motor Section, Truck Company No. 2, A. E. F., a suit case containing various articles, and that she wrote to him daily, but that in his letters he complained of nonreceipt of mail.

December 26, 1917, Mrs. Tomlinson advised, "I received a letter from my husband and he tells me that he received the suit case, also 25 letters at one time, and it was not the fault of the post-office facilities that he was not receiving them on time. It was due to the fact of his being only one night in one town. Thanking you for your kind interest."

December 8, 1917, William D. Fullerton, Ottawa, Ill., advised that since the 12th of September some 25 letters had been forwarded to "Lieut. Charles B. Fullerton, U. S. R., unassigned, A. E. F." He sailed from Hoboken about the 13th of September. Up to the 10th of November he had received no mail except a bunch of newspapers mailed from Chicago.

December 24, 1917, Mr. Fullerton advised, "I have a letter from Lieut. Fullerton, U. S. R., Company K, Twenty-sixth Infantry, acknowledging receipt on December 1 of letter I mailed him October 19, and other mail. But letters mailed prior to October 19 had not yet reached him. It is apparent that some of his mail is still being held up at some point."

December 13, 1917, Miss Eva Blodgett, 527 Plainfield Street, Springfield, Mass., advised that Pvt. Fred C. Partch, Company M, One hundred and third United States Infantry, Fifty-second Brigade, Twenty-sixth Division, American Expeditionary Forces, had not received letters from her.

December 24, 1917, Miss Blodgett advised that Pvt. Partch had received some mail from home.

December 10, 1917, the postmaster at Dixon, Ill., transmitted copy of a letter from Sergt. Harold Lenox, Quartermaster Corps, National Army United States, Army Post Office 701, via New York, France, in which he advised his father (Nov. 12, 1917) that he had received no mail from home. The statement was made to the postmaster that a letter had been written him each week, giving the same address as that in his letter.

December 26, 1917, Ed. Lenox, Dixon, Ill., advised, "In reply to your letter, am pleased to say that Harold Lenox is now receiving mail, first on November 14. Thanks for your prompt attention and interest."

December 17, 1917, Mr. Pierce Timmie, 124 Elmwood Street, Woodhaven, Long Island, N. Y., advised that mail addressed to his brother, Pvt. Colin Timmie, headquarters Seventeenth Engineers, Railway, was not being received.

December 26, 1917, Mr. Timmie wrote: "In acknowledging yours of December 22, I wish to advise you that on Saturday last I received a letter from my brother in which he acknowledged the receipt of a letter I mailed him at the end of September. I wish to thank you for your prompt attention."

December 18, 1917, the postmaster at Manchester, N. H., advised that Arthur S. Brown, of Manchester, complained that he had sent 25 or more letters and packages to Howard Mark Brown, One hundred and fourth Field Hospital, One hundred and first Sanitary Train, Twenty-fifth Division, American Expeditionary Forces, and that none of these had been received by the addressee. He stated that this field hospital was formerly known as the Fourth Field Hospital.

December 27, 1917, Mr. Brown advises that Howard M. Brown received four letters "some three weeks ago, but has not received any from me."

December 14, 1917, H. C. Zacharias, 231 Washington Lane, Johnstown, Pa., advised that September 24 he mailed to Pvt. Oliver W. Myers, Company C, Tenth Engineers Forestry Regiment, American Expeditionary Forces, a package containing various articles which had not been received by him.

December 19, 1917, Mr. Zacharias states that a letter has just been received from Pvt. Myers stating that the package reached him November 26, the date of his writing.

December 22, 1917, Mr. John H. Howard, Kingwood, W. Va., complains no mail reaches his son, First Lieut. F. C. Howard, Medical Officers Reserve Corps, United States Army, Two hundred and tenth Brigade, Royal Field Artillery, British Expeditionary Forces, France, stationed in France since August 1, 1917, and "well nigh a hundred letters" sent.

January 5, 1918, Mr. Howard states that he is communicating with The Adjutant General on the subject and that he received on January 5 letter from his son stating that 27 letters reached him at one time.

October 31, 1917, Mrs. G. W. Williams, Mercedes, Tex., states that according to letter dated London, October 10, her husband, with the American Expeditionary Forces, advises only two letters received from home, one dated August 12 and one August 26; believes some other "G. W. Williams" may have received rest of mail.

December 27, 1917, Great Britain, in reply to this department's letter on subject, advises that Mr. Williams states that all articles sent to him have been received.

December 15, 1917, Senator C. S. PAGE, Vermont, transmits letter of complaint from Mrs. S. B. Clark, St. Johnsbury, Vt., that her son, with the American Expeditionary Forces in France, is not receiving letters from home. States that son writes: "Mother, I can not think why I don't get a word from home."

January 7, 1918, Mrs. Clark now states letter received from her son in which he says he received two letters from home about December 10. Hopes other letters have now reached him. Mail from him reaches here in about 17 days.

December 22, 1917, Mr. Charles Buida, inspector of buildings, West Hoboken, N. J., writes in behalf of Mrs. Martin Gould relative to her son, Sergt. George F. Gould, Quartermaster, Engineers' Reserve Corps, American Expeditionary Forces, France, attached to Ninth Bakery Company, also addressed "Sergt. George F. Gould, Quartermaster Corps, Det., unassigned, care of General Headquarters, American Expeditionary Force," not receiving any mail from home.

January 4, 1918, Mrs. Gould advises receipt of letter from her son in which he says that all his mail has been received. Thanks to the department for consideration shown her.

November 28, 1917, Mrs. A. E. Gauerke, 519 Oak Street, Abilene, Tex., wants to know why newspapers do not reach her son, George Millier, Company A, Twelfth Regiment Railway Engineers, American Expeditionary Forces, France.

January 2, 1918, Mrs. Gauerke reports her son now "getting his papers all right."

December 27, 1917, Mr. Gus O. Henderson, 79 Milk Street, Boston, Mass., transmits newspaper clipping stating that report that mail for American Expeditionary Forces is being held up is not true, and adds that if this is so, to explain why his son, Lieut. Elliott Henderson has not received a single letter from home since he landed in France, the latter part of September.

January 7, 1918, Mr. Henderson advises receipt of letter from his son dated December 8 stating he has received in one package 25 letters from home, "which includes practically all that have been written."

October 26, 1917, postmaster Delavan, Wis., reports complaint by Mrs. Frank W. Hall that letters sent to her husband, who is with the British Expeditionary Forces, are not reaching him.

January 7, 1918, postmaster Delavan, Wis., advised that Great Britain states Lieut. Frank W. Hall admits receipt of all correspondence and instructed to so inform Mrs. Hall.

December 28, 1917, Mrs. Fannie G. Horne, 360 East Two hundred and first Street, New York, states she sent, on October 3 package to her son, William J. Horne, Company F, Eleventh United States Regular Railway Engineers, American Expeditionary Forces, France, and one October 26, and three for Christmas, but from his last letter he has not received the first packages sent.

January 3, 1918, Mrs. Horne advises that her son writes, under date of December 5, acknowledging receipt of two packages and regrets any annoyance caused by her complaint.

November 26, 1917, Mr. Robert H. Dippy, Philadelphia, Pa., says he receives letters from his son in France, but at least 12 to 15 letters sent to France previous to November 1 have not reached addressee.

December 20, 1917, Mr. Dippy advises receipt of four or five letters from his son now stationed in Italy, but that only about three letters sent were received by his son.

January 5, 1918, Mr. Dippy advises receipt of five letters, dated from November 1 to December 14, in which his son says he received mail from this country sent during the month of October.

December 21, 1917, Mrs. Marc Thibault, 165 Nashua Street, Fall River, Mass., complains that her son, Alfred Thibault, Third Company, One hundred and first Ammunition Train, Twenty-sixth Division Motor Truck, American Expeditionary Forces, France, does not receive mail from home.

December 30, 1917, Mrs. Thibault advises word from her son that he now receives his mail.

December 5, 1917, Miss Madeline M. Morrison, Palouse, Wash., states that letter from Lieut. J. J. Lippincott, Eleventh Engineer Regiment, American Expeditionary Forces, France, informs that none of her letters received by him.

December 30, 1917, Miss Morrison writes, "I am happy to report that in a letter written by him, November 15, he acknowledged the receipt of several of my letters which had just begun to come."

December 5, 1917, Congressman H. M. JACOWAY, Arkansas, transmits letter from Mr. Morris M. Cohn, Little Rock, Ark., stating that out of some 40 packages sent to his son, First Lieut. Louis M. Cohn, with the American Expeditionary Forces in France, only 2 have reached him.

January 1, 1918, Mr. Cohn advises arrival at destination of a number of packages addressed to First Lieut. Louis M. Cohn, Battery M, Sixth Regiment, Coast Artillery Corps, American Expeditionary Forces, and advises, "He reports the receipt of eight or nine packages."

December 7, 1917, Mrs. James H. Reynolds, 17 South Pine Street, Lock Haven, Pa., asks why mail does not reach her son, H. B. Reynolds, American Naval Base, Pauillac, Gironde, France.

December 28, 1917, Mrs. Reynolds reports that her son is now receiving his mail from the States and, "I am very grateful to you for attending to the matter for me, and if I can at any time be of any service to you I sure will be at your service."

December 6, 1917, Congressman AUGUSTINE LONERGAN, Connecticut, submits letter from Miss Agnes N. Kelly, Hartford, Conn., in behalf of Mr. Marcell Lavole, 72 Camfield Avenue, Hartford, Conn., respecting mail sent to his son, Pvt. Edward E. Lavole, One hundred and second Machine Gun Company, American Expeditionary Forces, France. Mail sent to his boy once a week, but none received.

December 30, 1917, Mr. Lavole writes that he has recently received word from Pvt. Lavole stating he has received the mail in question.

December 20, 1917, Hill, Clarke & Co. (Inc.), Boston, Mass., write that letters are being received from Second Lieut. Henry Ware Clarke, American Expeditionary Forces, detached service, France, but none received by him from home. Packages have also been sent, with same address.

December 30, 1917, Mr. C. A. Clarke reports, "I am pleased to say that up to November 28 Lieut. Clarke had received 1 letter and 1 package; but since then, within a week or two afterwards, he received 20 letters in one bunch. There are missing, however, about 30 letters and a dozen or more packages, some of them important * * * but now that he is definitely located with the Regular Army I imagine he will receive his mail regularly."

December 2, 1917, Miss Nellie C. Creeden, 59 Bellevue Street, Lowell, Mass., asks why mail does not reach some of her friends over in France with the One hundred and first United States Infantry.

December 30, 1917, Miss Creeden advises that her letter dated October 21 was received by the addressee, Sergt. Thomas J. McDermott, Company M, One hundred and first Infantry, American Expeditionary Forces, on November 17. His letters, dated November 29 and 30, have just arrived here.

December 28, 1917, Mrs. Frank R. Potter, Rural Delivery No. 6, Amsterdam, N. Y., states that her son was sent to France about September 8 and she just received word that no mail from any source had reached him since early in October. Christmas box sent him November 13, and wants to know whether it reached the addressee.

January 8, 1918, Mrs. Potter writes: "Pvt. Henry B. Potter received 17 letters on December 18, so am in hopes he will receive his mail in future."

December 28, 1917, Mr. F. M. Collins, 92 Line Street, Somerville, Mass., asks in re nondelivery numerous parcels sent his brother, Pvt. George Collins, Company E, One hundred and first Regiment Infantry, Twenty-sixth Division Overseas, Fifty-first Brigade, American Expeditionary Forces, via New York. By letter dated December 1 he makes no mention of articles sent to him, and it is therefore concluded that none have reached him.

January 8, 1918, Mr. Collins advises receipt of letter from his brother stating that several packages addressed to him have been received.

November 16, 1917, postmaster, Ashbury Park, N. J., advises complaint by Mrs. S. W. Hoffman, 703 Bond Street, Asbury Park, N. J., of non-receipt of mail sent to her husband, First Lieut. S. W. Hoffman, Forty-seventh Company, Fifth Regiment United States Marines, in France.

January 3, 1918, Mrs. Hoffman writes: "Have received mail from Lieut. Hoffman. He also has received my mail. Thanking you for your interest."

December 19, 1917, Miss Ebba V. Anderson, 486 Elton Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., states that box containing knitted muffler and also letter sent about two weeks ago to her cousin, Carl H. Anderson, Fourteenth Engineers, Company E, American Expeditionary Forces, not received by him, as advised in his letter dated November 15.

January 10, 1918, Miss Anderson writes: "Since I last wrote you I received a letter from him stating he had received the package I sent him, also my letter. Thanking you * * *"

January 15, 1918, Mr. William H. Dechant, Reading Pa., states that his son, with the American Expeditionary Forces in France, in his last letter, dated December 14, advised the receipt of only one letter since he arrived in France November 3. He started for France about October 18, and 8 or 10 letters were written him since.

January 23, 1918, Mr. Dechant writes that he has heard from his son, who states he is receiving his letters and is in fine spirits.

November 13, 1917, Mr. Charles S. Turner, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., states that letters do not reach Lieut. Arthur H. Turner, Sixth Regiment, Marine Corps, American Expeditionary Forces, according to letters from him dated October 24 and 25, letters being mailed to him every day.

December 22, 1917, United States postal agent in France, respecting this case, advises that he took the matter up personally and has received a reply from Capt. A. H. Turner, stating that his letters are numbered consecutively and are being regularly received without any extraordinary delay. On January 22, 1918, the complainant, Mr. C. S. Turner, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., was advised of the postal agent's report.

January 24, 1918, Mr. J. B. Pratte, Bristol, Conn., complains no mail received from his son, Joseph V. Pratte, Company D, One hundred and second United States Infantry, American Expeditionary Forces.

February 2, 1918, Mr. Pratte writes: "I received four letters since January 30, dated January 2, 1918, and was very glad to receive them."

January 9, 1918, Miss Gertrude Peterson, San Francisco, Cal., advises word from Pvt. George L. Frye, Company A, Eighteenth Engineers, American Expeditionary Forces, that package mailed him October 11 by insured parcel post has not been received, but that two Christmas boxes mailed November 30 were received.

January 22, 1918, Miss Peterson advises the receipt of a letter from Pvt. Frye stating that package in question arrived, and thanks department for attention given her complaint.

January 5, 1918, Hon. AMBROSE KENNEDY, of Rhode Island, House of Representatives, transmits a letter from Mr. J. Frank Mara, Pawtucket, R. I., respecting nondelivery of mail to his son, Edwin M. Mara, Brigade Headquarters Detachment, Fifty-first Brigade, United States Field Artillery, American Expeditionary Forces. About 30 or 40 letters sent him, but not one received.

January 14, 1918, Mrs. J. Frank Mara reports receipt of letter from her son stating he had just received a letter from home dated October 9, 1917.

January 5, 1918, Ellen G. Greene, Pittsburgh, Pa., advises that her brother, Harold D. Greene, Company A, Twenty-sixth Engineers, American Expeditionary Forces, writes on December 15 that he has not heard from home since his arrival in France, letters being mailed him three or four times a week.

January 19, 1918, Ellen C. Greene states that her brother writes under date of December 28 that he has received several letters and packages from home.

December 27, 1917, Mrs. E. C. Chambers, Portland, Me., states she has written several letters to her son, Pvt. George L. Bradbury, One hundred and first Regiment United States Engineers, American Expeditionary Forces, Company A, Twenty-sixth Division, and has received seven letters from him asking her to write.

January 24, 1918, Mrs. Chambers advises her son has received all letters mailed him.

January 11, 1918, Mr. E. C. Cobb, Fremont, N. C., advises letters and packages sent since October 15 to Edgar E. Cobb, Aviation Section of the Signal Enlisted Reserve Corps, Second Aviation Instruction Center, American Expeditionary Forces, and that cablegram from him dated January 11 states he has not heard a word nor received a package.

January 17, 1918, Hon. GEORGE E. HOOD, House of Representatives, writes on the same case.

January 19, 1918, Mr. Cobb writes: "Am pleased to inform you that Edgar E. Cobb has at last received mail from us."

December 21, 1917, Mrs. M. Goulden, Chicago, Ill., states she has written her son, Pvt. Lewis A. Goulden, Company G, Second United States Engineers, American Expeditionary Forces, about a dozen letters and sent him packages, but on November 15 he wrote saying nothing received and wonders what is wrong.

January 9, 1918, Mrs. Goulden writes: "I want to say my son has received two of my letters, and, of course, he feels better now."

January 2, 1918, Mrs. John Hackett, West Allis, Wis., states her son, William J. Hackett, American Red Cross, Buffalo Motor Unit, American Expeditionary Forces, writes under date of December 12 that he has not received one word from home. About 20 letters and 6 packages sent him. Other members of the same unit seem to be getting their mail. Mrs. Hackett gives two addresses, one to American Red Cross, 79 Rue Langier, Paris France, and one to Chateau des Halles, par Sainte Foy Largetieue, Rhone, France.

January 23, 1918, Mrs. Hackett writes that her son, under date of December 24, advises he received some letters from home December 23 and two Christmas boxes.

January 11, 1918, Mr. William P. Hill, Providence, R. I., complains letters to P. W. Hill, Battery A, One hundred and fiftieth United States Field Artillery, Sixty-seventh Brigade, Forty-second (Rainbow) Division, American Expeditionary Forces, do not reach him.

January 21, 1918, Mrs. Hill reports receipt of letter from Mr. P. W. Hill dated January 18, 1918, saying he received two letters from her and one from his brother; also papers and magazines.

December 31, 1917, E. B. McGilvary, Madison, Wis., asks re non-receipt of mail by his son, Paton McGilvary, American Aviation Detachment, American Expeditionary Forces, Italy. He heard from home before September 18 and not again until November 11, when he received two letters, one dated September 2 and one October 1.

January 14, 1918, Mr. McGilvary writes: "I am informed by my son that he has received the mail matter in question. Within the last few days I received a letter from him reporting that he had received on November 30 'quite a batch of mail.' I presume that what he had not received at the time I wrote he may have gotten since, now that communications seem to have become established again."

January 5, 1918, postmaster, Augusta, Ga., advises inquiry by Mr. William Frank re parcel mailed to his son, Corp. William W. Frank, Marine Engineer Reserve Corps, American Expeditionary Forces, United States Army, base hospital No. 8, France.

January 15, 1918, Mr. Frank reports: "I made no complaint and have none to make, since all mail matter, letters as well as parcels, have been received by our son very regularly for the past three or four months; so also has his mail reached us promptly."

December 18, 1917, postmaster, Columbus, Ohio, advises complaint from E. M. Heller, that city, that six parcels of tobacco, candy, etc., mailed between September 10 and December 1, addressed to Frank E. Heller, Company E, Fourth United States Army, Forty-second Division, Camp Mills, Long Island, N. Y., and to Company E, Fourth United States Army, American Expeditionary Forces, have not reached addressee, but first-class mail has been delivered.

January 18, 1918, postmaster, Columbus, Ohio, writes: "Beg to advise that Mr. Frank E. Heller now states all mail is being properly delivered to him," and that this information was obtained from A. E. Heller, the complainant.

January 8, 1918, Mrs. Edna V. Weston, Edgartown, Mass., writes that letters to her husband, Lieut. A. D. Weston, Company A, Twenty-sixth Engineers, American Expeditionary Forces, mailed him from October 29 at the rate of six each week, have not reached him, according to letter received from him dated December 16.

January 20, 1918, Mrs. Weston writes that letter received from her husband advises that he received a bundle of mail on December 23.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,

Bloomington, Ind., January 24, 1918.

MERCHANTS' ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK

Division of Mail Inquiry, New York, N. Y.

GENTLEMEN: In regard to your request for the chamber of commerce to furnish you a statement concerning the local mail service, we are pleased to submit the following brief report:

The past two weeks we have experienced the worst winter weather in the history of Indiana, the temperature being below zero nearly every day, and some days from 14 to 20 degrees below. In addition to this, the deepest snow ever known here has hindered all traffic. The wagon roads have been blocked for days at a time with miles of snowdrifts in many places on the level with the road fences, making transportation impossible, even on our main highway.

Our two railroads have also experienced great difficulty in running trains and are unable to make their regular schedules. For a few days all trains were annulled and on other occasions the trains were from 2 hours to 14 hours late, due to the deep snowdrifts on the tracks.

Any delay of mail in this locality has been due to the acts of Providence and not to the acts of the Postmaster General. We have heard no complaint from the business men, but, on the contrary, have heard many compliments on the prompt and efficient service rendered by the department even under adverse conditions of the weather. For instance, friends and relatives have mailed over 600 Christmas boxes to their soldier boys in France. Not one was lost so far as known, and the boys received their presents in time for Christmas.

Our local office is in charge of the most accommodating postmaster Bloomington ever had. He devotes his entire time to the duties of his office and does not permit politics to interfere with the efficiency of the service.

Very truly, yours,

(Signed)

C. G. CREIGHTON,
Secretary-Manager.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contribution to the maintenance of the International Bureau of Weights and Measures, in conformity with the terms of the convention of May 24, 1875, the same to be paid, under the direction of the Secretary of State, to said bureau on its certificate of apportionment, \$2,895.

Mr. DILL, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, I want to say that it seems to me that the basis which

the President laid down in his address on peace, delivered to the House on the 8th of January, 1918, when he said that open covenants and open treaties were the first necessity, is a basis that can be indorsed not only by all Americans but by the free peoples of the world around. I do not believe history has ever shown a period when the world suffered so much from secret treaties and secret agreements as it has for the last three years and is now suffering. For that reason I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing certain documents and treaties recently published by the New York newspapers. They show what a wonderful work has been done by President Wilson since we entered the war in making this war really and truly a war for democracy and justice. By those treaties nations were to divide up conquered countries, but this Government's influence has been such that all that has been changed and the former territorial agreements renounced.

Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask how much space in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be required to publish these treaties?

Mr. DILL. I do not know exactly; probably four or five pages. I do not think it will exceed that. I would not want to say definitely, as the documents were published in two or three installments in the New York papers. I am not certain; but not to exceed six or seven pages at most.

Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH. I have no objection to that, but I do not want to have three or four volumes put in.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, in the absence of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], who is the censor of outside matter offered for printing in the RECORD, I ask the gentleman to withdraw his request for the present.

Mr. DILL. Mr. Chairman, these are Government documents of the Russian Government. If the gentleman from Massachusetts is not on the floor, that is his fault.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was busily engaged on another matter. Will the gentleman kindly inform the House again the character of the publication?

Mr. DILL. They are documents and communications to the Russian Government, which have recently been published, showing the secret treaties existing at the beginning of the war and before the war between the European nations.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the objection, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BLACK. Does the gentleman have any fault to find, for instance, with the Italian treaty, by which our allies induced Italy to join them in the war against the Imperial German Government?

Mr. DILL. I may say to the gentleman that it is not for the purpose of criticism but for the purpose of furnishing information that I proposed to place these documents in the RECORD just as a matter of historic record. A number of Members have said they would like to read these documents if they were all collected in one place.

Mr. BLACK. Has the gentleman any assurance that this synopsis of these treaties is correct?

Mr. DILL. They are not synopses, but complete documents. They were given out by the Russian Government and published in the New York newspapers. I have no authenticated statement by the Secretary of State or by any of our own Government officials.

Mr. BLACK. Has the gentleman seen any acknowledgment by any of the allies that these treaties were in fact made?

Mr. DILL. No; I have not.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. What are these treaties?

Mr. DILL. They are a number of communications that during the war have been sent to the Russian Government, especially when the Czar was in power, and following his being deposed, and they have been recently published by the present Russian Government.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Communications?

Mr. DILL. Yes; they were published in New York dailies some two weeks ago, I think.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Were they authoritatively published?

Mr. DILL. As authoritatively as any treaty that is published in a newspaper.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. What I mean is, did they purport to be published on authority of any representative of the Government?

Mr. DILL. Oh, yes; they were given out by those in control of the Russian Government at the time of their publication in Petrograd.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DILL. I ask for two minutes more so that I may answer the questions of the gentleman from Virginia.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks that he may proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Have they been in anywise verified by the representatives of the Government on whose behalf they purport to have been issued?

Mr. DILL. Not to my knowledge. They were simply given out by the authority of the Russian Government. I do not think there is any denial of them.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Would we not be filling up our RECORD then with matters whose authenticity may be questioned?

Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH. As I understand their authenticity has not been denied.

Mr. DILL. I do not think there is any doubt of their authenticity. There is only one complete treaty. The rest are largely discussions by ambassadors back and forth, referring to treaties.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. What is to be gained by their publication?

Mr. DILL. It is simply a matter of putting them in the RECORD in order that they may be available to the House and to the country.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DILL. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. These documents were published by Lenine and Trotzky, were they not?

Mr. DILL. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. And published together with a lot of criticism of the allies.

Mr. DILL. There is no criticism in the statement of the treaties which I have.

Mr. HARDY. They were published purporting to have been discoveries from the secret archives of the Czar.

Mr. DILL. I think so; yes.

Mr. HARDY. The whole motive was to throw blame on the allies in connection with this war?

Mr. DILL. I do not think that, but rather to throw blame on the Czar for the way he handled the Russian Government.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Is it the desire of the Government that this material should be published?

Mr. DILL. I do not know about that.

Mr. HARDY. My recollection is that they came out with a lot of criticism by the Bolsheviks.

Mr. DILL. That may be, but I simply proposed to insert the documents. It has been said they show a number of agreements, which, in fact, they do not show.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BORLAND. Reserving the right to object—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to insert some remarks in the RECORD by printing certain documents. Is there objection?

Mr. BORLAND. Reserving the right to object, these are what purport to be copies of secret treaties entered into by the authority of the Russian Government and some other Government—the German Government, for instance?

Mr. DILL. No; there are none with the German Government or with any of her allies among those I have seen published in this series.

Mr. BORLAND. They are treaties purporting to be entered into by the Russian Government with other countries?

Mr. DILL. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. They are not official copies, but newspaper or unofficial copies.

Mr. DILL. I think that is true of all treaties published in the newspapers.

Mr. BORLAND. With some comments on them?

Mr. DILL. No; I have no intention of including any comments, other than my own comments to show how President Wilson has lifted the purpose of this war to a fight for real world democracy.

Mr. BORLAND. Irrespective of the fact that secret treaties may violate our policy of the Government, inasmuch as Russia is a friendly power and these are not official, does not the gentleman think that, while it might have its proper place in the press, it would not have a proper place in the official records of Congress?

Mr. DILL. Not necessarily. I do not see how any injury can be done by printing them in the RECORD when they are already common knowledge. We would be revealing no secrets; we would be simply setting forth the records as given out by the officials of the Russian Government.

Mr. BORLAND. It seems to me, with all deference to my colleague, that they hardly deserve to be placed in our RECORD. They might be referred to in speeches, but I hardly think that they should be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. DILL. I did not intend to place them in the middle of the RECORD, but in an extension of my remarks. I might have

gotten time in general debate and read them, but I thought that I would save the time of the House, and they would be there for the reference of Members of the House. Then no mistake could be made as to what they contain. That was my only purpose.

Mr. BORLAND. I believe, Mr. Chairman, for the present I will object.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 10, line 25, strike out the figures "47,500" and insert "20,500."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, never in the history of this moribund Commission on International Boundary between the United States and Mexico have they ever had such a large appropriation in the 13 years of its existence as that recommended by the committee to-day. We all know that when once these commissions are organized they are mighty hard to get rid of. This is another exemplification of that rule. In fact, the work has been so futile and of such little value that the predecessor of the present commissioner, a former noted, painstaking, industrious, and capable Representative of this House, the Hon. John Wesley Gaines, resigned from the commission because he found there was no work to perform. He was ashamed to accept the salary of \$5,000, and in order to justify some work for the salary he was receiving, as I was informed, he wished to indulge in some irrigation project utilizing the waters of the Rio Grande. The commission has been in existence for 13 years, and we never have appropriated more than \$35,000 for it. I can understand how a new commissioner coming into this position wishes to magnify the work and present estimates—as the commissioner from Tennessee, Judge Lucius D. Hill, has—of \$90,000 for extensive work in the ever-changing river bed of the Rio Grande. But I respectfully submit to the committee that this is not the time to increase appropriations. It is true that \$25,000 is not much these days, when we are appropriating hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars. It is true that this commission, if it wanted to engage in the survey of the Colorado River or other rivers down there, could expend hundreds of thousands of dollars, but it is a question whether this is an appropriate time to engage in this outside work, especially in view of the pressure upon the Treasury by reason of the war conditions.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. The gentleman says this commission—and I suppose he was speaking sarcastically, as I suppose he was in some other remarks he made—

Mr. STAFFORD. No; I was speaking seriously.

Mr. SLAYDEN. He said something about the survey of the Colorado and other rivers. Does not the gentleman know the importance of the Rio Grande, and the reason for this is to remove possibilities for international complications with another sovereignty? That is the importance of it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I cited the Colorado advisedly and not sarcastically, because I examined the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which includes an estimate by this distinguished gentleman, who wants to branch out all of a sudden, and in that estimate I find a survey of the Colorado River, \$25,000.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Well, I will withdraw my observation with regard to the Colorado River and ask the gentleman to confine his attention for the moment to that part of my question which touched the value of the Rio Grande River as the boundary line between the two sovereignties, Mexico and the United States.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is no question but that we should have some well-marked line between Mexico and the United States, but I think, and the gentleman from Texas knows far better than I do, because I never saw the ever-changing bed of the Rio Grande, that it will be difficult under all circumstances to establish a boundary line.

But the time is not opportune, I take it, to engage in this survey work when the Treasury is in such need of additional funds for war activities. This work has been postponed all these years. Some commissioners have found it to be needless. Gentlemen know full well that when we create these commissions it is a most difficult task, even after their work is completed, to get rid of them. In this exigency, why should we increase this appropriation? I have no objection to continuing this deserving Democrat in office. It is spoils, and has been spoils for years. Grant that, but why should we increase the appropriation when it is not necessary?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, the usually correct gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] is a little bit mistaken as to the history of this commission. It has been in existence a good while. It was brought into existence by reason of a treaty between this country and the Republic of Mexico. The first commissioner we had—and we had him for a long, long time—was an Army officer, Gen. Anson Mills, a most efficient man. He drew no salary from this appropriation. He was a retired Army officer and got the salary of a retired Army officer and rendered this service without getting any additional salary from the Government. Our distinguished ex-colleague, Mr. Gaines, was the secretary of this commission. There were two commissions then. He was the water commissioner and the secretary to the boundary commission under the treaty. Mr. Gaines did not resign because there was no work to do. An unfortunate circumstance occurred in reference to an estimate sent to Congress in reference to Mr. Gaines's salary, which irritated him, and for that reason he resigned, because he did not think the State Department had remedied that mistake quickly enough. Mr. Gaines had proposed to do extensive work, which did not meet with the approval of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Recently Judge Hill has been appointed commissioner, and his corps of assistants has been filled, and he has been engaged in this work for the last year. During the time that Mr. Gaines was the secretary and the acting commissioner Mexico had no commission. Conditions have improved in Mexico since that time and she now has a commissioner, and that commissioner and our commissioner are at work trying to settle the boundary questions between this country and Mexico, so as to avoid in the future any international complications between these two countries. Judge Hill recommended the survey of the Rio Grande and the Colorado Rivers, with a view of finding a basis for a change in the treaty between these two countries. The boundary line is constantly shifting.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Which Colorado was that? The Colorado of the West?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Not the Colorado in Texas?

Mr. FLOOD. No.

Mr. SLAYDEN. The Colorado of the West runs into the Gulf of Mexico and is an international stream.

Mr. FLOOD. A part of the boundary line.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Yes; and the other is not.

Mr. FLOOD. No. I understood from what I gathered in the hearings that Judge Hill wanted to make a proposition by which a fixed boundary could be established instead of a varying boundary which varies with the shifting of the Rio Grande River, and for that reason he asked for \$91,000. The committee cut that down to \$47,500, as the committee thought that amount would enable them to do the work on the Rio Grande and postpone the work on the Colorado for the present, settle the question of these bancos in the present existing stream, and enable Judge Hill to make a report that the State Department could use as a basis for a new treaty. Twenty-two thousand five hundred dollars, which the gentleman has suggested, would keep this commission alive and pay the salaries, but it would not enable the commission to do the work essential to settle controverted matters between this country and Mexico and avoid international disputes in the future and lay a basis for a most sensible settlement of the question. I hope, therefore, that the gentleman will withdraw his amendment, or, failing that, that the amendment will be voted down and that we will give this commission a chance to make the investigations in the Rio Grande River and make a report to Congress at the next session, and at any rate enable the commission to keep down any irritating questions between this country and Mexico. We are not in position to encourage irritation with any of our neighbors or any other foreign nation.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if Mexico now has a commissioner on the ground?

Mr. FLOOD. It has; fully equipped.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Ready to cooperate with our commission in the work that is laid upon them?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes; it has a fully equipped commissioner and assistants.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] made a very astounding statement just a few moments ago. He was discussing the delay in the delivery of our mails in France, and he

assigned as one of the chief causes the fact that we did not have a sufficient number of mail clerks in France to do this work. He said that up until some three weeks ago we had only about 40 clerks assigned to this duty, that the Government had made provision in the last three weeks to send over 26 more men, provided it could get the transportation facilities to send those 26 abroad. He said that the Government was experiencing difficulty in getting these men at this particular port in France which our mails all pass through. It seems to me that if the Government of the United States is experiencing a great difficulty in transporting 26 men to France, it is going to find it is more than a man's job to get a million men in the fighting line over there. If this statement of the gentleman from Indiana is true, or is based upon fact, I believe that the Senator from Oregon the other day ought to have gone a step further and said that not only had the War Department fallen down, but the Shipping Board and also the Navy had fallen down. I can not understand why it should be found to be a difficult matter to get 26 men to France, when the War Department is boasting of the fact that it is going to have a million and a half men in France by midsummer. If the gentleman's statement is true, I believe the people of the United States are justified in the belief that somebody connected with the War Department is indulging in a species of camouflage. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

BOUNDARY LINE, ALASKA AND CANADA, AND THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA.

To enable the Secretary of State to mark the boundary and make the surveys incidental thereto between the Territory of Alaska and the Dominion of Canada, in conformity with the award of the Alaskan Boundary Tribunal and existing treaties, including employment at the seat of government of such surveyors, computers, draftsmen, and clerks as are necessary; and for the more effective demarcation and mapping, pursuant to the treaty of April 11, 1908, between the United States and Great Britain, of the land and water boundary line between the United States and the Dominion of Canada, as established under existing treaties, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State, including the salaries of the commissioner and the necessary engineers, surveyors, draftsmen, computers, and clerks in the field and at the seat of government, rental of offices at Washington, D. C., expense of printing and necessary traveling, for payment for timber necessarily cut in determining the boundary line not to exceed \$500, and commutation to members of the field force while on field duty or actual expenses not exceeding \$3.50 per day each, to be expended in accordance with regulations from time to time prescribed by the Secretary of State, \$60,000, together with the unexpended balances of previous appropriations for these objects: *Provided*, That hereafter advances of money under the appropriation "Boundary line, Alaska and Canada, and the United States and Canada," may be made to the commissioner on the part of the United States and by his authority to chiefs of parties, who shall give bond under such rules and regulations and in such sum as the Secretary of State may direct, and accounts arising under advances shall be rendered through and by the commissioner on the part of the United States to the Treasury Department as under advances heretofore made to chiefs of parties: *Provided*, That when the commissioner is absent from Washington on official business he shall be allowed actual and necessary expenses of subsistence, not in excess of \$8 per day.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. I notice two changes in existing law—one limiting the amount of daily expenses for subsistence of the commissioner to \$8 a day, and increasing the per diem allowance to the field force from \$2.50 to \$3.50 per day. What is the purpose of the proviso as to the amount that may be expended by the commissioner when outside of the District on official business to \$8 a day, which is in the nature of a limitation? Has the evidence disclosed that there has been a larger amount expended in the past, or at present is the amount lower than that of \$8?

Mr. FLOOD. The amount is lower. The amount is \$4 a day.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the reason for allowing him \$8 a day when in other branches of the service we only allow for subsistence, while traveling in the United States, \$4 per day. We are met by the Secretary of Commerce in making claims on behalf of commercial attachés, commercial agents, to increase the per diem allowance for subsistence while absent from the country, and the committee has not so far acted favorably; in fact, the Secretary of Commerce has recently requested that the per diem allowance of our commercial attaché at Buenos Aires, the most expensive capital in the world, be increased to \$7 per day, and here we are asked that this commissioner be allowed \$8 per day.

Mr. FLOOD. Well, the reason for that is this: He is a commissioner of the United States, and goes up to these meetings where he meets the commissioner of Canada. He has to stop at a decent hotel, which the gentleman well knows he could not stop at on \$4 a day, and he made the statement to the committee that during last year his expenses were \$8 a day; that he could

not hold them below \$8, and he got reimbursed \$4, and the committee thought it was fair to pay his expenses. The committee was impressed with the business ability and desire for economy on the part of this commissioner and the splendid work he had been doing, and they thought he ought to have a sum that would cover his actual expenses.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, as I happen to be very familiar with the gentleman and the work of the commission, as it is nearly all performed on the boundary line between Minnesota and Canada, I sincerely trust that the gentleman will not insist on his point of order. The \$4-a-day limitation heretofore is insufficient to pay a man's subsistence. This commissioner is frequently compelled to go to Canada, often to the capital, to consult with the commissioner from Canada. It is a matter of common knowledge that you can not even obtain a room at a hotel for \$4 a day.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I will have to take issue with that statement. I happened to be a member, back in 1908, of a nonofficial commission that visited Canada, a commission to investigate the question of pulp and paper supply, and we stopped at the King Edward Hotel in Toronto, and the rates were only \$3 a day.

Mr. FLOOD. Conditions have changed since then.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I hear that all around that conditions have changed and yet outside of Washington the hotel proprietors in Detroit, in Chicago, in my home city, in New York, are not charging more than they did prior to the war or during the war. In this city it is true visitors are held up in an outrageous fashion. The persons who visit here are held up to the very highest point the service will bear. A man reaches here at 11 or 12 o'clock midnight and they increase their rates up to as high as \$5 and \$6 for lodging, whereas the published rates were \$1.50 for a room. It is an outrageous condition.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Just a moment, if the gentleman will permit me to finish my statement. I know he wants to be fair. I would like to indorse all he has said about the hotel charges here in Washington. It has ceased to be keeping a hotel and it has come to be legalized highway robbery.

The Congress compels people over this country to come to Washington to transact public business and they of necessity are compelled to stop at hotels and there they are just simply robbed. There is no relationship of any kind whatever between the accommodations furnished and the charges made. In fact, I advise my friends who come here when they go to one of the three or four leading hotels that they bring enough money to buy the hotel, then stay the three or four days and sell. Their loss will not be greater than the sum they would have been compelled to pay had they stayed there and paid the ordinary charges. It is a crime. Conscience ended when the Washington hotel proprietor came into being. There ought to be a new crime designated to cover this offense and a law should be passed to punish such robbery. There ought to be a penalty placed upon such a practice. Now, then, having those conditions in mind, I would like to have the gentleman really reflect that 1908 is not 1918—

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Let me finish this sentence. I was up to this point indorsing what the gentleman said. Hotel rates in Canada are double what they were; for instance, not room rent is doubled but it is very much advanced, probably 50 per cent, but café rates, meals, are more than doubled, and any man who leaves this country to go up to Ottawa, Toronto, or Montreal, wherever the commission happens to meet—it does not meet very often, and the amount involved is ridiculously small; it is only a few dollars a year, very few—is compelled to meet these increased prices.

Mr. FLOOD. I will say to the gentleman here that in the last fiscal year this commissioner was out of Washington 25 days, and the expense of that, charged to the Government, was \$100. During the coming fiscal year he expects to have more conferences, owing to some additional work, and he estimates he will be out of the city on this mission about 60 days.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman must recognize the danger of precedents. We are besieged in the Committee on Appropriations to increase the per diem allowance all the way from \$4 to \$8 a day. If we allow it to be established here—

Mr. FLOOD. Suppose we make it \$6.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not wish to appear parsimonious, and if the gentleman wishes to make it \$6 I have no objection, although I think it should be lower.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. We ought to give him enough to pay his honest expenses. He can not live on \$6 while traveling in this country or Canada, or in any other place, and I will defy

the gentleman from Wisconsin to ride on a train from here to Chicago or Milwaukee, and come back, and show that he lived on \$6 a day. He can not do it and he knows he can not.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman has challenged me to cite an instance. You can get a room in the city of Detroit, and I will take that as an example, in the Hotel Statler, as good a hotel as the gentleman from Minnesota or myself would wish to stop at, and certainly this commissioner would wish to patronize, with bath, at \$2.50 a day. This gentleman not only gets his allowance for subsistence but he gets his allowance also for traveling expenses. I would not be so insistent on questioning this amount were it not that if we adopted it here we would have to adopt it in other activities of the Government. And this Congress is not ready to adopt a per diem allowance to its officials, no matter how high an estate they fill, of \$8 a day.

Here is the Secretary of Commerce. He is now acting as one of the commissioners in determining the fisheries dispute between Canada and the United States. He is allowed only \$5 a day. True, his expenses are much more, and he has to pay them out of his pocket. Those are conditions which may have to befall some of our officials, because we have to adopt a standard for all. It may be hard upon some, but we can not make fish of one and fowl of another. We will have to have some general rule, and to increase the allowance to our officials from \$4 to \$8 a day is a jump that I do not think this Congress is ready to take.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. If the gentleman has completed, I would like to end the sentence I started and let us have this finished. The gentleman can not travel in the United States on \$6 a day, and I know it and he knows it, and stop at the Hotel Statler or any other decent hotel in the United States. This man is required to go to Canada on a foreign service. He is not traveling inside the United States. I suppose it would be comports with the gentleman's idea that this commissioner, representing the United States, should go to Canada, go to some commercial club, and ask to be directed to the cheapest room in town and say, "My country is so poor and so miserable, and thinks so little of having the boundary line properly placed, I have got to hunt the cheapest room in town; and please show me where I can eat at a dairy lunch." I do not know whether that represents the ideas of the gentleman or not, but it would appear so from what he says. I think this man who goes only occasionally as a commissioner, representing the United States in a foreign country, ought to be permitted to spend at least \$8 a day, when the Canadians, who have an entire country less in population and wealth than the Empire State alone, give their man very much more than \$8 a day for his subsistence—very much more.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion there?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Certainly.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. This bill carries for the court of China an appropriation of \$10 a day for a judge, and I understand that under the law all Federal district judges now get \$10 a day for expenses.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. That is correct.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman allow me to correct his impression?

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. While the law places a maximum amount of \$10 a day, nevertheless in the administration of that law the judges return in many instances much less for expenses.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Ten dollars is the limit.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. This commission here gets as much as \$10 a day.

Mr. SMITH of New York. This item says "not in excess of \$8 a day."

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Let me add one thing further.

This country has had commissions of all kinds representing it on a great variety of international questions. I do not want to reflect on the good work anybody else has done, but I leave it to the Members of this House who know if he has not done the best job for less money than has been done for Uncle Sam by any commissioner on a matter of this kind. He has performed a splendid service, has reduced his requests, almost cut them in two—about half this year of what they were before—and the job is just about done. For efficiency, industry, and all-around capacity he practically stands unique among the men who have been called to deal with foreign countries in behalf of the United States in matters of this kind.

Mr. WALSH. Who is this man?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. He is Mr. Barnard, a member of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, who was selected from that

important body because of his high scientific and professional qualifications.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have nothing to withdraw after having made my statement. I would not object to this one person, except for the fear of a precedent, and I do not intend to have it established as a precedent for the reasons stated.

Mr. FLOOD. Does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. I do.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I want to argue the point of order. This is only a limitation on the amount appropriated here and is not subject to a point of order. It is true that in the past we have carried under this proviso only \$4 a day for actual expenses, but that is merely a limitation on the amount appropriated, and I submit that it is not subject to a point of order. We limit the amount that can be actually expended for this particular work. I have not the general law here, although I tried to find it, but I do not think it is stipulated that it can not be more than \$4 a day.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I am quite surprised and other members of the committee will be surprised that the distinguished member of the Foreign Affairs Committee should be so mistaken, and that he should say to the House that there has been carried in this item a proviso limiting the amount at \$4 a day. If he will examine last year's appropriation bill he will find that there is no such proviso connected with this item, but if he will examine the general law he will find that there is a limitation placing the amount at \$4 a day, carried in one of our appropriation acts, for subsistence where not otherwise provided by existing law.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. I was looking for that statute. Has the gentleman got it at hand?

Mr. STAFFORD. I can easily get it from the Committee on Appropriations. We placed that limit on an appropriation bill some years ago to prevent the practice of allowing officials an unlimited amount in the way of expenses for subsistence.

Mr. FLOOD. I suggest to the gentleman that he withdraw his point of order, and I will offer an amendment making it \$6 a day.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to be reasonable. I have no objection to that.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I hope the chairman of the committee will not do that. Let us have this settled. If the gentleman wants to exercise his right—and any one man can do it—under the facts and circumstances that are plain and apparent, let him do it. I am willing to pass the hat around and take up enough to give this man a chance to live respectably in Canada.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman withdraw his point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. I made the point of order.

Mr. FLOOD. I was going to move to substitute "six" for "eight."

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. I want to know if the gentleman from Wisconsin has withdrawn his point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. That is what the Chair is trying to ascertain.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it the desire of the gentleman from Virginia to insert \$6 and have that amount accepted by the committee?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman withdraw his point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw it under that condition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 18, strike out "\$8" and insert in lieu thereof "\$6."

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, do I understand the committee is really bound by this arrangement? Would it be considered a breach of faith if the committee should vote down this amendment and it should be left at \$8? If the committee votes down the motion just made by the gentleman from Virginia, the point of order having been withdrawn, then, as I understand it, this gentleman will be able to travel to Canada and put up at a decent hotel and the amount will not be in excess of \$8 a day.

Mr. LENROOT. In view of what has occurred, does not the gentleman think that if any member of the committee was opposed to this amendment he should have spoken before the gentleman from Wisconsin withdrew his point of order?

Mr. FLOOD. I should think so.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I so stated, and asked the chairman of the committee not to consent to any such arrangement

and not to move to make it any lower. The reason I inquired was to find out if it would be considered a breach of good faith to vote down the amendment.

Mr. FLOOD. I hope the gentleman will let the \$6 amendment be adopted. I think we will better serve the purpose we have in view in that way.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia, reducing the amount to \$6.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For salary of one member of the permanent committee of the International Institute of Agriculture for the calendar year 1919, \$3,600.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of speaking briefly of the work of the American representative at the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome, Italy. As most of us know, the American representative to this institute is Mr. David Lubin. In my opinion Mr. Lubin is one of the most eminent authorities on agricultural subjects, particularly on the marketing of agricultural products, in the world. A year or two ago Mr. Lubin appeared before our Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and made a very illuminating statement and argument with reference to the marketing of agricultural products, the fundamental idea of his proposition being to place the consumer in our larger centers of population in communication with the producer out in the country. I hope the Members of the House when they have the opportunity to do so will take the time to study some of these observations that have been gathered by him in his experience and study in European countries. Recently Mr. Lubin sent to this country an urgent report upon the food situation as it affects the nations now engaged in the great war, and during my time I am going to ask the Clerk to read this statement of Mr. Lubin.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOOD FROM UNITED STATES VITAL TO ALLIES, IS WARNING—EUROPE'S CROPS MAY BE WORSE THAN LAST YEAR, DAVID LUBIN REPORTS—MAY CALL OUR WOMEN.

ROME, January 22.

"Food is the most important matter now before the allies," David Lubin, American representative in the International Institute of Agriculture, said to-day. "It is useless to deceive ourselves.

"It is necessary to feed our armies well, and in view of the increasing consumption of food and decreasing production we shall be unable to do this unless exceptional weather prevails this spring and unless extraordinary measures are applied.

"I am reporting to the State Department, and also to Congress, that Europe's crops may be worse than last year's, and that the mobilization of women of the United States for farm work may be necessary. We should also consider plans for devoting land in the 11 arid States to grazing purposes, so that the United States will be able to supply cattle for replenishment of the diminishing stocks.

"Our allies are depending upon the United States. Without its help they would reach a condition similar to that in Germany and Austria, in which there is merely food enough for the armies, with the civil population dying off."

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, does any Member of the House doubt the importance of the situation as outlined by Mr. Lubin in his statement? It is a matter of serious concern that the American people as a whole shall be thoroughly awake to the conditions as they exist. Our allies, who for nearly four long years have beat back with their treasure and their blood the most heartless and cruel military despotism that ever disgraced the annals of human history, must not be neglected in the hour of their mortal peril, and it is inconceivable to me that the people of the United States will fail to do their duty in this supreme hour. Will the American farmer do his duty? He will. But I doubt if it will be possible to speed up production in the United States of agricultural products very much, if any, in 1918 over that of 1917. There are many obstacles in the way, such as shortage of farm labor, high price of seed, unusual droughts, and so forth. But there is one thing which is entirely possible and which is capable of yielding great results, and that thing is an earnest and willing cooperation with the Federal Food Administration in its efforts to husband and conserve the food supply which we now have and will have as a result of 1918 harvests. The savings effected by one family obeying the regulations of the Food Administration is, of course, a small matter within itself, but when multiplied by 10,000,000 families it means a great deal and is the thing which stands between our success or failure.

If the voluntary methods thus far pursued in this important matter are successful, then all well and good. If they are not successful then this Congress must authorize stronger measures. The result must be had, and in accomplishing those results we can not afford to fail. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Without objection the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL HIGH COMMISSION.

To defray the actual and necessary expenses on the part of the United States section of the International High Commission, arising in such work and investigations as may be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, \$25,000, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the item just read.

The hearings and report disclose that this is a new activity to be undertaken by our already overburdened Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. McAdoo.

It is of a character of work that is performed and has been performed by the State Department and the Department of Commerce. It is now suggested to divide this work and its responsibilities still further by having this commission created as an adjunct to the Treasury Department under the immediate supervision of the Secretary of the Treasury. Its work, as testified before the Committee on Foreign Affairs by the former Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. John Bassett Moore, is to try to bring about uniformity of commercial regulations, uniformity of fiscal regulations, and uniformity of charges and treatment of commercial travelers. We have in the Department of Commerce a bureau that has been attempting to extend the commerce of the United States, to which bureau are attached commercial attachés and commercial agents. We appropriate hundreds of thousands of dollars for the extension of the commerce of the United States under the supervision of that bureau. We have under the Department of State a Bureau of Foreign Commerce. We also have divisions in that department relating to South American affairs, Latin American affairs, Central American affairs, and Mexican affairs. Now it is proposed to establish an independent bureau outside of these two bureaus, where the Government is already performing work of a similar character, and to have it connected with the Treasury Department. Unless some good reason can be assigned for the further differentiation and separation of this work from the two departments that are now performing kindred work, I shall be compelled to make a point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, just one word, unless the Chair is ready to rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would be glad to have the act read.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Flood] predicates his entire case upon the act of February 7, 1916, which was an enabling act to assist the Secretary of the Treasury to confirm in fact the nine delegates of the American section that had been appointed by him at the first meeting of the American Financial Conference that was held in Washington in 1915, so as to attend the meeting that was to be held at Buenos Aires, Argentina, later in the year 1916. The whole phraseology of the act, which I shall read, bears out the contention that it was merely an enabling act, and to confirm the action of the Secretary of the Treasury in appointing the delegates that were to assemble at the financial conference to be held that year at Buenos Aires. Read it closely; even the first paragraph and the second show the temporary character of this legislation:

That the appointment of the nine delegates by the Secretary of the Treasury to represent the United States in the proceedings of the International High Commission to be held in Buenos Aires, Argentina, during the year 1916, in accordance with the action of the first Pan-American Conference held in Washington during the year 1916, pursuant to the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 4, 1915, entitled "An act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916," be, and the same is hereby, approved and confirmed. Such delegates shall be known as the United States Section of the International High Commission, and shall cooperate with the other sections of the commission to take action upon the recommendations of the first Pan American Financial Conference, and the President is authorized to fill vacancies that may occur in the United States section of said international commission.

Mark you, in construing this act, we have to take all the act together. That is fundamental. I wish to read the second paragraph, which bears out the contention that it was merely temporary:

For the purpose of meeting such actual and necessary expenses on the part of the United States section of the commission that may arise from its work and investigations, or as may be incidental to its attendance at the meeting—

Not the meetings, but the meeting—

of the said International High Commission, the sum of \$40,000 is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, to be immediately available, and to remain available until expended.

That was the meeting of the Pan American Financial Conference at Buenos Aires in that year, not the meetings, and was to give recognition to an action of the Secretary of the Treasury, for which he had no authority, when he took that action in 1915,

prior to the passage of this enabling act, whereby the appointment of those nine delegates was approved, and any vacancies that should occur before the meeting at Buenos Aires could be filled by the President of the United States. If the Treasury Department officials—and Dr. Rowe is an Assistant Secretary there—had believed that this was permanent, he would not have come before the Committee on Foreign Affairs and asked for permanent legislation as embodied in the proposed act printed in the hearings which has been read by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Flood]. True, that act is broader in its scope than the language carried in this bill, but there is no authorization for this International High Commission; there has never been any authorization in the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill in prior years since we passed the act of February 6, 1916.

Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH. Does not the gentleman realize that the Secretary of the Treasury in appointing the delegates originally had no authority of law whatever, and that that was the reason why he came before Congress to get the authorization?

Mr. STAFFORD. I remember the incident. He came before Congress to gain recognition, so that these delegates when they met at the second conference at Buenos Aires would have the authority to assemble there in that congress as a part of that section, but not to any succeeding congresses.

Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH. But that is the law, giving it a legal status.

Mr. STAFFORD. An act was passed in advance of the passage of the Diplomatic and Consular bill, passed in advance, so that the Secretary of the Treasury would have authority to send them down there and have an appropriation for that purpose prior to the assembling of the congress and prior to the passage of the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill.

Mr. FLOOD. May I interrupt the gentleman for a moment?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. FLOOD. We do not contend, and this provision does not provide, that there shall be any delegates to any future conferences. There has been but one Pan American Financial Congress and that was the one held in Washington in 1915; but it is a permanent commission, consisting of a few representatives from each of the Pan American countries, that was created by the financial conference which met here, and the creation of which, so far as the American section of it is concerned, was ratified and approved by act of Congress of February 7, 1916, and these gentlemen constitute the American section of the International High Commission now, and this provision is simply an appropriation to take care of their work and the salary of one or two clerks.

Mr. STAFFORD. While it is true there has been only one Pan American financial conference, there has been a provision carried in the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill providing for the holding a second Pan American Financial Conference—

Mr. FLOOD. Oh, no.

Mr. STAFFORD. I can give the gentleman—

Mr. FLOOD. That was not a conference; that was a meeting of this International High Commission.

Mr. STAFFORD. I can give the gentleman authority for that in his own appropriation bill.

Mr. FLOOD. I know that commission met here, but not a conference.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair is ready to rule, I do not desire to detain him.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. GILLET. As acknowledged by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Flood], the Secretary of the Treasury had appointed nine delegates to represent the United States in the proposed International High Commission. He had appointed these nine delegates without any authority of law at all, and I suppose when it came to the determination of how they should be paid, he found there must be some authority of law.

Mr. FLOOD. They have never been paid anything.

Mr. GILLET. Of course their expenses have to be paid.

Mr. FLOOD. The expenses; yes.

Mr. GILLET. When the Secretary of the Treasury came to decide how it was to be paid he doubtless consulted the statute and found no authority. There has to be some authority, and this statute was enacted. It simply says that the nine delegates which he had already appointed to this International High Commission, appointed, as admitted, without any authority of law, that their appointment is ratified and approved. Now, he certainly did not appoint them as a permanent body, because, in the first place, we know he would not assume to, and in the second place, it says here he simply appointed them as delegates on this commission. Therefore, up to that clause there is no

authority at all for holding that they are a permanent commission. This simply approves the appointment of the Secretary of these nine delegates on this commission, and whatever comes after that in this statute, which is depended upon, simply gives them the title and says that the President may fill vacancies. I can not see how there is the slightest shadow of a foundation for claiming that there is any permanent commission here established.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH. I would like to read the statement made by Dr. Rowe. I would like to have this put in for the benefit of the Members on the other side:

Mr. ROWE. The International High Commission was organized as the result of a resolution adopted by the Pan American Financial Conference of 1915. That conference was called by the President of the United States and was composed of officially appointed delegates by the Governments of Central and South America, with the exception of Mexico. Diplomatic relations with Mexico had not been resumed at that time, so that Mexico was not represented. The assembled official delegates adopted a resolution organizing the International High Commission, providing for the appointment in each country of a national section. The Governments in each country appointed these national sections, composed of nine members, with the minister of finance chairman of each section. The International High Commission has received the official recognition of all the Governments, in some cases directly through legislation, in other cases indirectly through appropriations made by national legislatures for the support of the commission. The International High Commission constitutes the permanent organization of the financial conference.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman put his finger on the statute of the United States that provides or indicates that this commission now exists? What the gentleman has read is that other Governments have recognized it. Our Government has only recognized it to the extent of making appropriations for one year, and all the statute does upon which the gentleman relies is to make an appropriation to enable the delegates to make investigation and then to attend a single meeting in 1916. So far as our statutes are concerned, there is not a single syllable that indicates that this commission has any life at all, so far as the Government of the United States is concerned.

Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH. I think the gentleman is entirely mistaken in my opinion. The law creates the commission.

Mr. GOOD. Point to the statute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] makes the point of order against the provision in the bill making an appropriation for the International High Commission on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill not authorized by law. It is undoubtedly the practice of the House under its rules that a committee proposing legislation must show authority of law for the legislation to make it in order on an appropriation bill. The Chair has listened attentively to the arguments and the acts of Congress read bearing on the case. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Flood] contends that the Secretary of the Treasury appointed delegates to attend a convention, and that those delegates, in connection with delegates from other countries, organized this International High Commission. It is admitted that there was no provision of law authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to appoint said delegates. Subsequently Congress passed a law ratifying the appointment by the Secretary of the Treasury of the aforesaid delegates and made an appropriation to pay their expenses while attending the conference. The gentleman from Virginia contends that in the act of Congress ratifying the appointment of such delegates, Congress approved their act in establishing the International High Commission and making it a permanent organization.

The Chair will ask if he has not correctly stated the position of the gentleman from Virginia? The Chair is of the opinion there has been no specific authority of law cited the Chair that authorizes the creation of a permanent high commission. The Chair does not believe Congress could be said by simply ratifying the appointment of delegates to a convention to approve the legislation of the convention to which the delegates were accredited unless Congress specifically so stated in the act itself. The Chair does not believe Congress will ever delegate its legislating functions to any other body or convention. Therefore the Chair is constrained to hold that there is no law authorizing the creation of this high commission; that the paragraph is new legislation and is not in order on an appropriation bill. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

The appropriation of \$40,000 "For the purpose of defraying the expenses in Washington City incident to the Nineteenth Conference of the Interparliamentary Union to be held in Washington in 1915, to be expended under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe," made in the act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and extended and made available for the calendar years 1916,

1917, and 1918, not having been expended, is hereby extended and made available for the calendar year 1919: *Provided*, That said sum may, in the discretion of the Secretary of State, be expended within the United States, but not elsewhere: *Provided further*, That an itemized account of all expenditures shall be reported to Congress.

Mr. LONGWORTH and Mr. FLOOD rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Flood] is recognized.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. FLOOD. I will say, Mr. Chairman, as to that item, that there are a number of items of reappropriation in this bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Let it be reported, so that a point of order may be made against it.

Mr. FLOOD. All right.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Flood: Page 21, after line 15, insert the following as a new paragraph:

"FIFTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS AGAINST ALCOHOLISM.

"Any unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for the Fifteenth International Congress against Alcoholism are hereby reappropriated and made available until expended."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I want to state that that item was not reported in this bill for the reason that the State Department made no suggestion in reference to it. These items we have just been over are items of reappropriation. The department did not suggest that this unexpended balance be reappropriated, because the construction of the Department of State was that the work had been going on, and they construed the language of the last appropriation bill to make a permanent appropriation of that amount. And so they did not make any suggestion that the unexpended balance be reappropriated. Subsequently I called the department's attention to that, and it was taken up by the State Department with the Treasury Department, and I was informed from the State Department that the Treasury Department thought the unexpended balance would have to be reappropriated or they could not pay warrants on the appropriation. And I think that this appropriation ought to stand on the same footing with these other reappropriations we are making. I am told by these gentlemen that just as soon as the war is over they expect to hold this conference against alcoholism.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do I understand that the Fifteenth International Congress against Alcoholism, which was provided for in the last appropriation bill, did not meet?

Mr. FLOOD. It did not meet. I think it has been in three appropriation bills. It did not meet, and this is just to put it on the same footing with the Nineteenth Conference Interparliamentary Union that we have been making appropriations for.

Mr. STAFFORD. Of course, if it did not meet and have an opportunity to do the work that was expected of it, I, of course, can not see any reason they should be disappointed at holding a conference some time in the future. Of course, there might not be any occasion for holding it in accordance with the original intention, but it might be a ratification affair or some kind of a jollification affair. I will withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Flood].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. This seems to be the fourth appropriation for this Interparliamentary Union. Has that conference ever taken place?

Mr. FLOOD. It never has.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Is it ever going to take place?

Mr. FLOOD. I am informed by my friend from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN], who is chairman of the American section, that it will take place just as soon as the war conditions permit—at the end of the war.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For salaries of consuls general, consuls, and vice consuls, as provided in the act approved February 5, 1915, entitled "An act for the improvement of the foreign service," \$1,208,500. No portion of this sum shall be paid as compensation to vice consuls who are not American citizens: *Provided*, That if in any case the Secretary of State deems it impracticable immediately to secure a competent vice consul who is an American citizen, he may appoint or retain as vice consul and compensate from this fund a person not an American citizen until such time as he is able to designate a competent American citizen for such post. Every consul general, consul, and, wherever practicable, every consular agent shall be an American citizen.

Mr. GOOD and Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] is recognized.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Will the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Flood] state whether the language beginning on line 17, page 22, "no portion of this sum shall be paid as compensation to vice consuls who are not American citizens," is new?

Mr. FLOOD. No. We have carried that in the bill for some time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Why is that language made to apply to vice consuls only?

Mr. FLOOD. Because they were the only men in the Consular Service who were not American citizens at the time this provision was put in the law.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is there a provision of law against a consul being an alien?

Mr. FLOOD. I do not know that there is any law, but there are no alien consuls.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Well, this matter was discussed at some length yesterday, and the expressions heard hereabouts were entirely in favor of having only Americans on guard in these places.

Mr. FLOOD. That is the view of the committee, unanimously the opinion of the committee, that there should be none. In the vice-consular branch of the service there were a good many men who were not American citizens, and this was put there to stop that practice, and to a very great extent aliens have been eliminated from the service. It is thought that in a few years they will be entirely eliminated.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do not know of any consuls that are not American citizens.

Mr. FLOOD. There are none.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But some years ago I came in contact with a few vice consuls who were not citizens, and I did not think they should represent us.

Mr. FLOOD. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think all such officers should be citizens of the United States.

Now, one more question. Does the State Department have a secret service?

Mr. FLOOD. It has.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is provision made for the payment of secret-service agents in this bill?

Mr. FLOOD. We have a lump-sum emergency fund of \$700,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That covers the secret service?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, this provision under consideration presents a serious question which, it seems to me, ought to be settled by the executive departments. But if the executive departments can not settle it sooner or later it must be settled by Congress. I suppose that after this war is over no more important question will occupy our attention than that of extending our commerce abroad. This bill carries \$1,208,500 for consular agents. The legislative bill carries, as I recall, somewhere between half a million dollars and seven hundred thousand dollars for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. This is the work our Secretary of Commerce is doing to extend our foreign trade.

A few days ago one of the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations appeared before the subcommittee on the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill and made a very complete statement and an impressive one regarding the service. We were impressed with the fact that there is duplication in the work now being done by the State Department and the Department of Commerce through its commercial attachés.

Now, I submit that when people are being taxed to the limit, as they are to-day, that ought not to be. We ought not to have two men doing one man's work in any branch of the service. We ought to cut out every bit of duplication wherever we find it. I know that the committee to which I have referred wants to accomplish that very thing, and I am sure the committee reporting this bill wants to accomplish the same result; but it does seem to me that in all fairness to these two committees of Congress the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce ought to get together on this proposition and agree upon a plan to cut out this useless waste, a waste admitted by both committees that have investigated it and admitted by everyone who makes a thorough and conscientious investigation of the subject.

We must extend our foreign commerce and we must extend it as we have never extended it before, when this war is over; and now it is time for Congress to set to work to cut out this duplication that has been forced upon us by these two branches of the service if they will not eliminate it for us. I do not know what amendments—

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a question there?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Which one of the two Secretaries, in the gentleman's opinion, ought to have jurisdiction of the subject?

Mr. GOOD. That question came up when we first appropriated money for the commercial attachés. A rather novel proposition was advanced in that the commercial attachés were to be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce and accredited to the State Department, and as I recollect, Secretary Bryan said he thought there would be no conflict between the two departments. As to which one of these two great departments should have jurisdiction over carrying on our domestic business abroad and extending our foreign trade I am not prepared to say.

I only know that at the time the commercial attachés were created there seemed to be a need for them. The State Department was not taking all the action and doing all the work it should do to extend our foreign trade. Certainly the Secretary of Commerce is fully awake to the needs for this service. It is a great service; no one wants to cripple it; but we should eliminate duplication.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Of course, the gentleman knows that a consul has no diplomatic function. His position is that of a business agent. His business is commercial.

Mr. GOOD. That is also true with respect to the commercial attachés. Their business is thoroughly commercial.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. But the commercial attachés were of an origin subsequent to the time when the consuls had this jurisdiction.

Mr. GOOD. But I think the gentleman will agree that both of these agencies, the consular agents and the commercial attachés, have duties that are similar and that are commercial rather than diplomatic. If these duties can not be performed by two separated departments without duplication, as has been claimed, they ought to be under one control, and Congress ought to know that there is no duplication of the work.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. There is one more question I want to ask if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Does not the gentleman think that the State Department has primarily to do with our foreign relations and ought to retain control of the consuls, and that the consuls ought to have jurisdiction over business affairs which relate to foreigners?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I do not think the statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin is exactly accurate. The consuls, in a sense, have a kind of diplomatic function. While they have not the right of personal access to a sovereign or government, whereby they would exercise in some degree a diplomatic function, they do represent the country diplomatically to a certain extent, so that if you are going to have a consolidation it ought to be under the State Department.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. There is no function exercised by a consular officer that is in any sense of the word diplomatic.

Mr. LONGWORTH. But the consular officer often looks after the interests of American citizens, not particularly business interests, as the commercial attaché would do.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, the State Department has a thoroughly well-organized Consular Service, and, as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] says, the commercial attachés and commercial agents representing the Department of Commerce are not attached to our Consular Service, and yet are in foreign countries doing a duplicate work. I thoroughly agree with him that the work should be consolidated in one department. The State Department has a splendidly organized Consular Service, the best in the world, and that is the department that ought to have it.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GOOD. I am not prepared to say which of these departments ought to have control of this work. The Secretary of Commerce is so admirably qualified to perform this work and is doing this work so efficiently that I should hesitate to deprive him of his duties unless I was satisfied that the State Department could do it better. When Congress made the appropriation providing for the commercial attachés it was on the showing made by the Secretary of Commerce that there was a work that the State Department was not performing, that our manufacturers were not able through the State Department to push their foreign trade to the extent that they felt they ought to push it and could push it, and therefore the appropriation was made by Congress. Congress agreed with the Secretary of Commerce.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good], who has just spoken, a question. Do I understand that the Committee on Appropriations is about to appropriate something like \$700,000 or a million dollars for these commercial attachés?

Mr. GOOD. No. The entire appropriation for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, for commercial attachés, and work of that kind, as I recall, is something in excess of \$500,000, and I had it in mind that it possibly ran up to \$700,000.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. It would be, however, a fair statement that they ask and expect to get about half a million dollars?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we have exemplified here the vice that creeps into our governmental system every now and then, and I suppose always will, growing out of the desire of a department to extend its influence and activities as it sees opportunity for work to be done. As old as nations are is the custom of having representatives of a nation abroad throughout the world, looking after the business interests, looking after the purely international relations between the Governments, and looking after the citizens. It seems to me that the consular system of the United States must continue to exist, and the major part of its functions is commercial. Of course incidental to that everybody knows that the Consular Service throughout the world is performing a great deal of important work in looking after American citizens who travel abroad. In fact, any American citizen traveling abroad will find that he is able to communicate with the legation or embassy at only about one place in the entire country, whereas he finds consuls scattered throughout the region. And they are of the utmost value and importance not only to commercial America but to the citizenship of America in a thousand and one ways. I am surprised to find the extent to which the Department of Commerce has gone in the sending out of these commercial attachés. I had no idea that they were carrying it to the extent indicated by this great appropriation that they are asking for. Apparently, it is a very decided increase over that which they had in the beginning, and I heartily concur in the suggestion made that this work should all be done in one department. It seems to me there can be but one department, and that is the State Department. I am in agreement with the distinguished chairman of this committee [Mr. Flood] in his statement that our Consular Service has come to be a remarkably efficient one. It is continually being improved. If our Consular Service had the \$500,000 or \$700,000 which it is proposed to squander on these commercial attachés, the Consular Service could do all the work that the commercial attachés are expected to do, and vastly more and vastly better.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Yes; certainly.

Mr. GOOD. I do not want to be misunderstood. My statement is not that we appropriate \$500,000 for the commercial attachés alone. It is for the entire Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. No such sum as that is appropriated for commercial attachés, but there are other employees abroad under the Department of Commerce. We were asked to eliminate the commercial attachés, but there is no provision in your bill taking them on. The gentleman certainly appreciates the great demand on our industrial and commercial interests that our trade abroad shall be extended.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I can assure the gentleman that if his committee drops the commercial attachés the consular agencies of the United States will take over all the work they

are expected to do, as well as the work that they are doing, and do it at a very greatly reduced expenditure.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is it not a fact that the consular reports dealing with particular subjects relating to trade are turned over by the Department of State to the Department of Commerce, which gives publicity to them?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. It is only because the Department of Commerce—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I move to strike out the last two words. This is a matter of great importance. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] has raised a question which is serious to both the State Department and the Department of Commerce. I have some knowledge of the organization of the commercial attachés connected with the Department of Commerce. They began in a small way. They were specialists sent out through the world with the view of bringing back to the United States information on certain special subjects. For instance, one man who was versed in cotton was sent into various countries to bring back reports as to what foreign countries were doing in cotton, and to inform the Department of Commerce as to the market for cotton throughout the world. Another, who had a specialty, which might be shipbuilding, was sent into foreign countries to ascertain what was being done in this direction, and he would very much better group that information by going as a specialist to various countries where shipbuilding was done than could a hundred consular agents who were reporting only for their particular localities.

Mr. STAFFORD rose.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin desire to ask a question?

Mr. STAFFORD. Only to point out that the gentleman is slightly in error when he refers to the work he has been describing as being undertaken by the commercial attachés. That work is undertaken by so-called commercial agents. The commercial attachés are some eight in all, located at the principal foreign capitals, and these commercial agents that the gentleman refers to are experts who travel through foreign countries examining trade conditions and then coming over here and making their reports.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. To the Department of Commerce, by whom they are sent out. Now, I question very much whether it would be the proper thing to turn over to the Department of State the collection of commercial statistics, or to rely upon it for their dissemination in the United States. Business men do not expect to go to the Department of State for information relating to trade conditions. Business men expect to go to the Department of Commerce. That was the purpose of the organization of that department—to ascertain trade conditions throughout the world and to disseminate that information to American merchants, manufacturers, and others concerned. The American consuls have a great deal to do besides the commercial work that is imposed upon them. Special inquiries are sometimes sent out and they are expected to make special reports, but that is apart from their general work. I would not want to see the commercial business turned over to the State Department, because we have turned that work over to the Department of Commerce. The business of the State Department is diplomatic. It has little to do with commerce as such.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. What the gentleman says about experts now and then delegated by the Department of Commerce to do some special work and make a report thereon is undoubtedly correct; but does not the gentleman recognize a wide difference between that sort of an institution and a regular group of agents of the department in foreign countries, who are there permanently, year after year, assuming to do that general commercial business which our Consular Service heretofore has always done and is expected to do, and is all the time undertaking to do?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If these men are supernumeraries, I am not justifying their appointment.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. That is exactly what they are.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am addressing myself to the point which was raised by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good]. I do not think that information on commercial subjects and intended for the business world should go to the public through the Department of State. These matters should be

handled by the Department of Commerce, which was created for that specific purpose.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, in line 17, page 22, the figures "\$1,208,500" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$1,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 32, line 17, after the word "service," strike out "\$1,208,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,000,000."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, as I recall, we appropriated \$100,000 for the commercial attachés. It is admitted here by the members of this committee that the work done by the commercial attachés is duplication of the work of the consular agents. Therefore there is no use in doing it here. If the Department of Commerce is doing it, and doing it well, and started the work when the State Department was not doing it, there is no use for the Secretary of State hiring other agents in the Consular Service to do that same work. In addition to the \$100,000 appropriated for the commercial attachés there is at least \$125,000 expended attending their work. So we can safely cut off \$208,500 and still accomplish the same thing.

Now, I do not want to hamper in the least this great work, for I realize the importance of extending our foreign trade, but I want to say that if the Secretary of State will not fight for a provision of this kind it is not worth having. The claims of duplication in this regard emanated from the State Department. Here he allows the Secretary of Commerce to come in and do the same work he is doing, and there is not a murmur from the Secretary of State, not a protest from the Secretary of State. It occurs to me that a man who will not fight openly to retain his jurisdiction will not put up much of a fight to extend our foreign trade. The only protest comes from the members of the committee that reported out this bill. They know that the duplication exists. They have called attention to it. That is not sufficient. The State Department having discovered that duplication exists in this regard, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce should get together, settle this question, and eliminate all duplication and pare down their appropriations.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, this seems to be a most remarkable proposition, to cut off the salaries of a great number of our consuls, vice consuls, and consular agents, or to reduce them, because the Committee on Appropriations of the House has established a new branch in the foreign service.

Mr. GOOD. The Congress authorized that branch of it, and not the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FLOOD. It came in in an appropriation bill.

Mr. GOOD. But it was discussed on the floor of the House.

Mr. FLOOD. Of course; but it started in an appropriation bill in the Appropriations Committee. If the Appropriations Committee, of which the gentleman is a member, had desired to get the advice of the Secretary of State and had invited him to appear before the committee, I have no doubt that he would have done so and given his advice; but I do think it is a criticism made against the Secretary of State that is not justified to say that he ought to come here and argue before a committee of Congress that another department of Government of which he is a part ought not to have such appropriations as that department has asked for.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. Does not the gentleman know that it is the opinion of the Secretary of State that there is duplication in this class of work that is being performed by the two departments of the Government?

Mr. FLOOD. I do not know what the Secretary of State says, but I do know that we have had gentlemen who have been connected with the State Department before the Committee on Foreign Affairs and asked them the question, and they said that it was a delicate question and one they did not care to answer.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The functions of a consular officer are very much wider than that of a commercial attaché, and the proposition of the gentleman from Iowa is to cut down the salary of the consular officers evidently to the extent that they are performing these functions.

Mr. GOOD. Oh, no.

Mr. FLOOD. That is the point I was going to make. We have a law fixing the salaries of the consular officers and this appropriation is to pay the officers in the field to-day, and the gentleman wants to reduce it so it would limit the appropriation to an amount insufficient to pay those consular officers.

Mr. GOOD. Of course I do not want to do that, but I want to ask this question: The gentleman has stated that a duplication exists; that we are wasting money. What is the gentleman's proposition to correct the evil?

Mr. FLOOD. I should say for the Committee on Appropriations to refuse to make the appropriation to the Department of Commerce for consular agents.

Mr. GOOD. Does the gentleman think we should do that when the last statement before the Appropriations Committee from the State Department was that there was no objection to the Secretary of Commerce doing the work which the Secretary of Commerce said was not being performed, and that the commercial and industrial interests of the United States demanded should be performed?

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman understands that the Secretary of State would feel a delicacy in coming here and making a contest about such a matter. Such action would certainly degenerate into an unseemly contest between two departments of the Government. The responsibility is not on the Department of State or the Secretary, but upon the Appropriations Committee for making an appropriation for commercial attachés.

Mr. GOOD. Does the gentleman contend that the Secretary of State's feeling of delicacy would extend so far that he would be willing that hundreds of thousands of dollars should be taken out of the Treasury of the United States in the performance of duplicate work rather than to go to the Secretary of Commerce and say, "Let us settle this matter in a business-like way"?

Mr. FLOOD. I do not know; but we had a very distinguished gentleman, the Hon. John Bassett Moore, before our committee, and when we asked him in reference to this matter he said he did not care to take it up and discuss it because it was a delicate question between two departments of the Government, one of which he had been connected with.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I desire to oppose the amendment. As I recollect it, the appropriation for these commercial agents was originally \$50,000 and now has grown to \$100,000. The appropriation carried in this bill for the consuls of the United States is \$1,208,500. It is apparent that the work done by the consuls is not in any large measure the work done by the agents under the Department of Commerce. The amounts appropriated respectively for these services indicate that. I understand also that the consuls are located at posts usually in commercial cities, seaports and otherwise, where their territorial jurisdiction, even within the country in which they serve, is limited. Their work is fairly well defined, their position is sedentary, and must necessarily be so. There is very little real duplication of work between them and the work that is proposed to be done by these agents under the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. The agents under the Foreign and Domestic Commerce Bureau are a counterpart of similar officials which originated, as I understand, under the plan of Germany when that country was first extending its commercial interests into South America, and which plan was afterwards adopted by Great Britain and to some extent by France and possibly by other countries.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. In just a minute. The purpose of these agents is not to duplicate the work of the consuls in any sense. They are to be accredited to the entire country, or possibly a group of countries, and are to be commercial experts from the United States, who make themselves familiar in the first place with the needs of that country in a commercial way, of the particular exports and products that can be used advantageously in that country, and the means of transportation and the best means of placing the product, and then places that information or themselves personally at the service of the American business man in this country. In other words, the agent is, as his name implies, the traveling representative of the entire business world of the United States, designed to acquire information which will be of service to all business men in this country in marketing their products in a foreign country. Manifestly a consul can do a very limited amount of that particular service. No doubt he can do some and in the past has done some, but in no sense does he take the place of these agents of the Department of Commerce. We are not intending to rely upon the Consular Service to secure foreign trade worth billions of dollars to the American business man. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman two questions. In the first place, is he aware that the commercial attachés of Great Britain or France or Germany, to which he has alluded, are all under the jurisdiction of the minister of foreign affairs in those countries?

Mr. BORLAND. No; and I do not know that that would cut any figure.

Mr. ROGERS. That has a very vital bearing on the question before the House.

Mr. BORLAND. I do not understand that the British Cabinet has a position similar to that of the Secretary of Commerce, unless it is the President of the Board of Trade, who is a member of the British Cabinet. He may be considered analogous in some way, or his functions may, to the Secretary of Commerce, but the functions of the British Board of Trade are more local, except where they are confined to navigation matters. I do not think they have what corresponds to our Department of Commerce, and I think the German Government possibly has from the operation of the Government and the way it extends its trade.

Mr. ROGERS. And also in France?

Mr. BORLAND. Possibly in France.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has explained very clearly the difference between the functions of the commercial attachés and the consuls. Will the gentleman explain the difference between the functions of the commercial attachés and the consuls general who have a jurisdiction as wide as the country to which they are accredited?

Mr. BORLAND. The same difference in less degree possibly occurs. The consul general has supervision over the consuls within his country, and, of course, he is in touch with the State Department as to the commercial conditions of that particular country, but he is not at the service of the business men except incidentally. He may, of course, render them great service in special cases, but his chief business is not to promote their interests.

Mr. ROGERS. I submit to the gentleman from Missouri that his chief function is to place himself at the service of the business men of the United States abroad, or doing business abroad, and that there can be no difference pointed out between the services performed by the commercial attachés and the services performed by the consul general.

Mr. BORLAND. I would point out to the gentleman that one of the most efficient governments in the world, and one which made a great success in extending its foreign trade for a decade or more prior to this war—the Government of Germany—found it extremely valuable and profitable to employ commercial agents.

Mr. ROGERS. Germany did that by making the commercial attaché a kind of super consul general. In other words, there was a chain of officers right down the line, all in one scheme of things. The difficulty with our problem is that we have two coordinate officers each responsible to two different Cabinet officers.

Mr. BORLAND. If all that is necessary is coordination, I might agree with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the amendment, and in withdrawing it I desire to state that I offered it knowing that if it should be adopted it might do some injury to this service. I am now satisfied that it would, and I withdraw the amendment. It was offered more to bring up this subject so that it might be discussed, and I will say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] that if he will talk with the Assistant Secretaries and the men in the Secretary of State's office he will find that not one of them will say there is any great difference between the commercial attachés and our consuls, and they will also tell him that there is a duplication of work. This claim of duplication emanates not from me but from the Department of State, but it comes in a diplomatic route. I want to say now to this committee that unless something is brought out in the next appropriation bill from this committee that will remedy this I think there will be some trouble along this line. It ought to be settled by the department and ought not to be settled by this committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

For 40 consular assistants, \$75,425: *Provided*, That from and after the 1st day of July, 1918, the salaries of consular assistants shall be at the rate of \$1,500 for the first year of continuous service, \$1,650 for the second year of continuous service, \$1,800 for the third year, and \$2,000 for the fourth year of continuous service and for each year

thereafter, and section 1704, Revised Statutes, its amendatory act of June 11, 1874, and all other acts inconsistent with this provision are hereby so amended.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on this paragraph changing the salaries of our consular assistants. As I understand, the initial salary of a consular assistant at the present time is \$1,000, and they are promoted by grades of \$200 up to \$1,800, which is the maximum. This provision makes \$2,000 the maximum grade. I wish to ask this question of the gentleman, whether in these recommendations for increase of salaries he or his committee has considered the possible general recommendation that will be reported either in a provision on an appropriation bill or by a resolution providing for a horizontal percentage increase of salaries of all employees connected with the service?

Mr. FLOOD. We did not take that into consideration, because we did not think it would apply to these consular assistants.

Mr. STAFFORD. For instance, last year the horizontal per cent increase of 5 and 10 per cent applied to every person in the service, except postal employees, and it would have applied to them had it not been that the officers of the postal organizations, as I am informed, opposed the amendment that was added to the Post Office appropriation bill in the Senate, and it was stricken out in conference. Now, it is planned, as I understand it, to introduce a resolution or provision upon an appropriation bill providing for an increase of all in the service, both in the departmental and in the field service, certainly all salaries under \$1,800, and very likely above. If we are going to grant the increases provided here the gentleman will give them double what they would ordinarily receive by the horizontal increase.

Mr. FLOOD. As I stated to the gentleman yesterday, I was opposed to an increase personally of any salary at this time and preferred to wait to have the salaries increased when the war ended, but this is an exception. These consular assistants render splendid service in consideration of the small amount which they get.

Mr. STAFFORD. I recognize there may be good grounds for an increase in their salaries, but if we are going to provide a \$200 increase above the general law, giving an additional 5 and 10 or more per cent besides, it is just going beyond what you contemplate.

Mr. FLOOD. I will say to the gentleman I did not understand the provision to be proposed in an appropriation bill making a general increase would apply to the foreign service.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand it would apply to all.

Mr. FLOOD. Of course, if that is the case it would increase these gentlemen more than the committee intended to increase them.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would not make the point of order if that was not in consideration, but I do not believe it was the intention of the chairman of the committee to increase them doubly.

Mr. FLOOD. We intended this to be the full amount.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, under the circumstances, as the House will presently have an opportunity to pass upon the question of the percentage of increase in the rate of compensation for all those in the service—

Mr. FLOOD. That does not meet the situation with them.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will make the point of order.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I trust the gentleman will not make that point of order, if the gentleman will yield a moment to me.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will reserve it at the request of the gentleman.

Mr. BORLAND. It is only contemplated, as the gentleman says, that a general resolution containing a horizontal raise shall be introduced, and possibly it will not meet with the approbation of the House when it is introduced.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, I can not agree with the gentleman at all in that. It is the almost unanimous sentiment, as I know, to bring in some resolution providing for a horizontal percentage increase of the salaries that the employees of the Government are now receiving.

Mr. BORLAND. If the gentleman will bear with me for a moment I will call attention to the fact that at a meeting of the employees last night they adopted a resolution providing for a commission to readjust and reclassify governmental employees, which, in my judgment, is a vast improvement in every way over a horizontal increase of salary, and if that commission is appointed to reclassify and readjust salaries, which I think is the only fair way to get at it, every one of these cases will be taken care of.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not one of those, when every employee of the Government at the present time is faced with the

dire necessity of paying higher prices for their living, who wants to postpone such increase until a commission reports. I have been too long in Congress not to know that a commission is resorted to as a means of postponement. [Applause.] I am in favor, and I believe Congress has committed itself to the consideration of this arrangement, and that this House is going to bring in a resolution providing for a horizontal percentage increase of salaries of every employee of the Government, whether in the legislative, executive, judicial, postal, or other branch.

Mr. FOSS. I want to say to the gentleman, if he will yield—

Mr. STAFFORD. I will yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOSS. That these consular assistants—

Mr. STAFFORD. My time has expired.

Mr. FOSS. I ask that the gentleman may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FOSS. I want to say to the gentleman that these consular assistants are not to be confused with consular clerks. They are quite a different proposition entirely. These consular assistants are assigned to assist consuls in other countries, not employed here in the State Department in Washington, and therefore you should not compare them with clerks in the other departments.

They are entirely different from the consular clerks. The clerks in the departments here in Washington are not on the same basis at all.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will say to the gentleman in reply that I am well aware that these consular assistants are high-grade clerks that are promoted ultimately to the Diplomatic Service, and I would not make the point of order were it not for the horizontal increase that is contemplated for all the employees of the Government.

Mr. FOSS. There are only a few of these. There are only 40 in all of these consular assistants.

Mr. STAFFORD. The chairman of the committee said when they made this recommendation that they did not take into consideration the horizontal increase.

Mr. FLOOD. I want to say this, that I do not suppose the horizontal increase the gentleman speaks of would make the increase we propose here. This is the most efficient set of representatives we have abroad, and these men are expected to go there now for \$1,000, and stay there for three years, and then they are increased \$200 a year.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman realize how difficult it is in a general bill providing for the horizontal increase of all our employees, to except certain employees? We have agents and consular agents, we have clerks, we have these assistants, who ought to be covered by reason of the increased cost of living, not only at home but abroad.

Mr. FLOOD. Of course, we have got to recognize that the cost of living all over the world has increased tremendously. Does the gentleman think we could get a man who was capable of performing the duty of a consular assistant, such a man as we would entrust with these important duties, for \$1,000 a year, to go to one of these posts and stay there for three years before any chance of increase at all?

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand that they are increased \$200 a year.

Mr. FLOOD. The rule is that they give him, first, \$1,000, and at the end of two years \$300, and then \$200 more. And we propose to make a right considerable increase in this, because they are the worst-paid officials in the Government service at home or abroad.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. Does the gentleman know the number of hours they serve every day, about?

Mr. FLOOD. I think they should serve as long the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] would require.

Mr. GOOD. Does not the gentleman think, inasmuch as we are fixing an eight-hour day for the clerks here at home, that these representatives abroad ought to be compelled also to serve eight hours a day?

Mr. FLOOD. I think so. The evidence before the committee was that they are very hard worked.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Is this discussion under the reservation of a point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. It is under unanimous consent the gentleman from Wisconsin is proceeding for five minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, if it were not for the fact that there is contemplated the introduction of a percentage increase, why I would not for a moment think of pressing the point of order. I will withhold it for a moment for the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Can I be recognized for five minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired. It depends on whether or not he withdraws the point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw it for the minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin a few moments ago made a speech that got the applause of the Members hereabouts who heard it. He talked very, very sweetly, and I had great hopes and expectations as to the result of that talk, but his words are no more than taken down by the Official Reporter than he changes. And there is no applause now in evidence when he is about to make the point of order. I think it is only justice, and small justice at that, that he be confronted with the enormity of the crime he is about to commit, and in order that I may contribute slightly to that picture before his eyes I speak these few sentences.

As the law now stands, a young man who wants to aspire to be a great representative of this great, rich country and go into a foreign field like Siberia, where they are now asking for new ones; into various parts of South America, where they are demanding new clerks; into China, where there is great opportunity for commercial expansion by the United States; and into other countries that might be named, and represent this great country with these great interests to be developed, can now receive that magnificent compensation of \$1,000 a year. And there is not a girl that comes to this town now to work for Uncle Sam, if she is able to pick up a sheet of paper and lay it down without blotting it, and is not able to do another thing, but that is getting more than \$1,000 a year the minute she starts. The increase proposed is to allow these young men that are going abroad \$1,000.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman should state that they will have to stay in these divisions three years before getting an increase.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman. I trust the gentleman from Wisconsin is taking this to his tender heart. Now, it is serious, because you can not get men to go out and do it for \$1,000. I know of instances during the past 18 months where men have started to enter this service and have quit because they could not go there and live after they got there. Now, these consular agents are men who are started in the service with the expectation that they will make good and eventually become consuls and perhaps consuls general.

You do not propose to give them money enough absolutely to keep the wolf from the door when they go to any parts of the world outside the United States. When the Secretary and his assistants were before our committee I propounded this inquiry: Having in mind all the needs of the foreign service of the United States, is not the greatest among them and the most insistent now to pay an increased compensation to the class of men mentioned in this paragraph? They said, "Yes"; that without an increase our system is practically paralyzed. This \$1,000 was the amount named back in 1874, originally, as I understand it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman inform the House how many resignations have taken place in this service in the last fiscal year?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I can not give the exact number, but I can assure the gentleman that a number have resigned.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. How many resignations have taken place throughout the service? That is the question. Has the percentage been greater here than in the balance of the service or has it been any less?

Mr. WALSH. I will ask the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER], who has recently returned from visiting some foreign countries, whether it is not a fact that \$1,000 will go much further in foreign lands than it will go here at home, and if it is not true that the increase in the cost of living is not so great there as it is in the United States?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. That was true some years ago, but it is not true now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I ask for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. In many of the countries the cost of living has increased to a very much greater extent than it has increased in the United States—200, 300, 500 per cent in some places. My attention has been called here to the increased cost of living in the various countries. I might as well insert it now. In Italy it is 65 per cent; in Spain, 25 per cent; in Greece, 200 per cent; in Sweden, 225 per cent; in Denmark, 70 per cent; in France, 20 per cent; in the Netherlands, 60 per cent; and should any of these representatives go into the Russian countries they will find that it has increased several hundred per cent.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I will call the gentleman's attention also to the increased price of coal abroad.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Yes. When I was in Paris it was \$90 a ton, and was still going up.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I stated in my previous remarks, I predicted my objection to this increase in salary on the fact that we were preparing a resolution increasing the salaries of all the clerks now receiving below \$1,800 to receive a percentage increase. I realize the difficulty confronted by the committee framing that resolution in excepting any branch of the service. I have had no intention to press the point of order against the increase of salaries in this item, but for that fact. I recognize that you secure a better class of employees by giving them higher initial salaries, so as to get a better class of applicants. I may be consulted in framing that percentage increase resolution, and if I am I will try to bear in mind excepting this class of employees. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I will not press the point of order. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman reserve or withdraw the point of order?

Mr. LONGWORTH. He withdraws it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin withdraws the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the President, in his discretion and in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, to make special allowances by way of additional compensation to consular and diplomatic officers and officers of the United States Court for China in order to adjust their official income to the ascertained cost of living at the posts to which they may be assigned, \$800,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, this item, known as the post-allowance fund, to authorize the President to increase the allowance by way of additional compensation of consular and diplomatic officers, in its total this year amounts to almost one-half of the total appropriation for our diplomatic and consular officers. This bill carries a total of \$534,500 for our diplomatic officers, and for our consular officers it carries an appropriation of \$1,208,000; and here it is provided that we are to authorize an increased compensation to the extent of almost 50 per cent in the salaries of our diplomatic officers.

I have heard in times past, when the subject of providing embassies for diplomatic officers was under consideration that salaries paid by the United States were very much lower, as compared with those paid by foreign countries. Seventeen thousand five hundred dollars is the maximum amount paid to our ambassadors extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary. Last year, Mr. Chairman, this item was restricted to those diplomatic and consular officers that were living in belligerent countries and countries tributary thereto. Now it is proposed to lift that limitation and make it apply generally to all, to the extent virtually of 50 per cent of the compensation of this force. I think it is incumbent upon the chairman of the committee to make some explanation of this extraordinary increase at one fell swoop in the salaries of all our diplomatic and consular officers. Last year only \$100,000 was appropriated, and here \$800,000 is asked.

Mr. FLOOD. The appropriation last year carried \$200,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. I beg the gentleman's pardon; it was \$200,000.

Mr. FLOOD. And the gentleman's Committee on Appropriations added another \$100,000 to it, making it \$300,000. We in-

creased it to \$800,000, because it was shown to the committee that it was necessary in order to take care of the living expenses of our diplomatic and consular officers abroad; not simply the diplomatic officers and consular officers alone, but in some cases the clerks as well.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. The phraseology does not grant that authority to the clerks as well. It is limited solely to special allowances by way of compensation to consular and diplomatic officers.

Mr. FLOOD. Well, that embraces the clerks and the consuls and ministers and ambassadors and secretaries and all. They make an allowance to all of this force out of this fund. The gentleman will see that the salaries paid to all of these representatives, including the clerks, is nearly \$3,000,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. But this item does not give authorization to pay increased salaries to clerks.

Mr. FLOOD. The diplomatic officers includes those.

Mr. STAFFORD. You do not mean to say that a clerk is a diplomatic officer?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes. Do you not think a secretary is a diplomatic officer?

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, yes; a secretary of legation is well known to be a diplomatic officer, but not a clerk.

Mr. FLOOD. They make allowances to the clerks from this fund.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then they have made it, in my humble opinion, without authorization of law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Even if the gentleman's construction of this item is the construction that would be adopted by the department handling it, still the gentleman sees that it is less than 50 per cent, or not much more than 50 per cent, of the amount paid in salaries to these officers at their posts now.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman would not recommend in one bill an increase of the salaries of the officers of the Government 50 per cent when, in continental United States, we are not providing for any increases of salaries of officers?

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman heard the statement made here yesterday that the secretaries and lower diplomatic officers at all our posts in France had been increased over 50 per cent during the past year, and the gentleman just heard the gentleman from Minnesota read a statement of what the increase was in the cost of living in the different countries of the world. I was with the gentleman in the position that the salaries of the secretaries should not be increased. The State Department, for instance, asked to increase the salary of the first secretary from \$3,000 to \$5,000. The committee recommended an increase to \$3,500. That was stricken out, and the salary remains at \$3,000. But the gentleman understood in our discussion yesterday that these very secretaries get from this fund \$1,500 additional, making \$4,500 a year for them; and the representatives of the State Department stated to our committee that these men just positively could not live in those countries unless they did that. Of course, there are some of these representatives who have independent means of their own and are not dependent upon their salaries, but there are others who are dependent upon their salaries, and they can not live on their salaries. I agree with the gentleman that the salaries ought not to be increased and that this post-allowance fund ought to be made large enough so that the State Department can during this temporary emergency increase the allowances to these officers.

Mr. STAFFORD. In that connection would the gentleman be willing that this authorization should exist merely during the pendency of the war?

Mr. FLOOD. Absolutely.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is no such limitation.

Mr. FLOOD. I know, but it was put in last year as a war measure.

Mr. STAFFORD. Last year the phraseology was different.

Mr. FLOOD. It was put in as a measure growing out of the existing war, and it was intended only as a war measure.

Mr. STAFFORD. Would the gentleman have any objection to inserting, after the words "special allowances," the words "during the pendency of the existing war and for six months thereafter"?

Mr. FLOOD. Not the slightest.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order and offer the following amendment.

Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I should like to suggest to the gentleman from Wisconsin that that amendment would not seem to be pertinent, and I do not see what it would accomplish. This appropriation is for one year. I do not see any harm in it, but I do not see any possible good in it. I have no objection to it.

Mr. FLOOD. Let it go.

Mr. STAFFORD. I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAFFORD: Page 24, line 1, after the word "allowances," insert the following: "During the pendency of the existing war and for six months after its termination."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I desire to discuss the amendment. I favor it, but would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] why it is preferred by the committee to recommend a lump sum of so large an amount for the benefit of these consular officers and others rather than give them a direct increase in salary?

Mr. FLOOD. The Department of State gathers from its representatives, ambassadors, ministers, and consuls to these various countries information as to the increased cost of living, and from this lump sum the attempt is made, as nearly as possible to add to the salaries of these men a sum sufficient to enable them to meet that increased cost of living. The cost of living is variable. It changes from time to time. The committee thought that was a better way to make an allowance to meet the increased cost of living than to increase their salaries.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. As to the increased cost of living I thoroughly agree with the gentleman, but Congress has always reserved to itself, or has usually reserved to itself, the right to fix these salaries, but in this instance, the only one I recall recently, we propose to turn over to the Secretary of State \$800,000, with which he may favor one employee of the department and perhaps not favor another. That is to say, he may make a certain allowance to one man in a certain place, or he may make no allowance at all to another man in another place, which might breed a species of favoritism that would not work well.

Mr. FLOOD. Of course there might be some cases of injustice. I do not think there have been any. I do not think it would be possible to get through a general increase of salaries, and I do not think it would be advisable. I think any salary that is increased now will remain, and will be the salary after peace returns. It might not be a proper salary in normal times.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is it not a fact that leaving this appropriation as it is, this lump appropriation of \$800,000, the Secretary of State has it in his power to reward one particular officer of the Government or to punish another?

Mr. FLOOD. Of course he would have that power, but it would be very difficult for him to do so without bringing severe criticism upon himself, because the apportionment is made according to a system. The reports are gotten from a place as to the increased cost of living at that place, and then make the apportionment of this fund and the allowance to the officers there upon that basis.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman state what the practice was with regard to the smaller allowance made in last year's bill?

Mr. FLOOD. The same; and in France, for instance, it was stated before the committee that as far as the fund permitted they made an increase of 50 per cent to the officials in Paris.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Was that a uniform increase?

Mr. FLOOD. Uniform to all the officials in Paris.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In one particular country?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Suppose a man happened to be in Africa?

Mr. FLOOD. If the increased cost of living there was ascertained to be 25 per cent, they would undertake to increase the allowance by adding 25 per cent to the salary of the man there.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does that particular consul figure up his expenses in his cost of living and forward a statement of them to the department?

Mr. FLOOD. I will quote from the testimony of Mr. Carr, which makes it clear:

Mr. CARR. Just as we have been doing. I would get the officer's reports first, upon what it would cost him to live, standardizing the thing by making each officer report on certain definite items, such as rent, clothing, etc., and in addition to that I would make him furnish us with a statement, as in the past, of how much an apartment of five rooms will cost, and how much a pair of shoes such as he wears will cost, and how much suitable clothes will cost him, and so on down through the different items, including items of food. I would compare them with the estimate made last year and the estimates made the year before. I would corroborate them also, as far as possible, by the published official reports of each foreign Government. For example,

Great Britain every year issues reports showing the cost of living, with the variation of prices of food and so on, which are very helpful in checking up these reports. On the basis of that I would reduce his report. For instance, an officer at one time estimated that he required \$2,000 for clothing for the year. I would cut that down to what seemed a reasonable amount.

They send in a statement of the cost of these articles for the period before we entered the war and the cost of them now, and the State Department puts officials to work to find out a proper basis based upon that information as to what the increase of cost of living is.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And it is left wholly to the discretion of the Secretary of State?

Mr. FLOOD. It is based on that system, and the Secretary of State could not depart from that in the interest of any particular person without subjecting himself to detection and severe criticism.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Without regard to politics, he could play favorites?

Mr. FLOOD. I suppose he could, but he would violate the proprieties of the situation and the decencies of his office, and, of course, no Secretary of State would do it.

Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER], a member of the committee, asked Mr. Carr, the Director of the Consular Service, why these salaries were not fixed instead of giving a lump-sum appropriation, and Mr. Carr said:

I should say under normal conditions that there would be no reason why that should be done. Under present conditions, however, I would prefer to see more adaptability to conditions. Congress should fix salaries, but this is not a salary per se. This is what we call a living allowance, which is added to the salary.

It is purely a matter of giving extra money to enable the foreign representatives to live.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman has posted himself in regard to that. Is it or not a fact that consuls have been moved from place to place, involving increased expenses, for diplomatic or other reasons of the department not political?

Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH. I presume they have been transferred for diplomatic reasons. I do not think the State Department would remove them for any other reasons.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Suppose it should be learned that one man was not quite efficient according to the requirements of the State Department, and they moved him to another place and did not make an allowance that he thought was sufficient for his proper maintenance?

Mr. FLOOD. Is the gentleman talking about consuls or diplomats?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Consuls.

Mr. FLOOD. On account of politics?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. No; a man might be moved for several reasons. I have been advised that some have been moved and some men did not understand why they were moved. That involves expense; a man might have leased some property on which he would lose.

Mr. FLOOD. The department recognizes that. They ask in this bill for an allowance to pay their expenses when removed. They do move them for various reasons, sometimes because they have not proved efficient in a particular place and have moved them to another place with equal dignity and equal salary. I do not believe they do it for any other reason than for the good of the service. The officials may be mistaken about it, but the Director of the Consular Bureau is a distinguished Republican.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; he is a good man.

Mr. FLOOD. I do not believe he would move a man, except for the good of the service.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. What is desired here is to give the Director of the Consular Service the discretion to move these men back and forth to fill or refill the places?

Mr. FLOOD. He has that authority and discretion under the law that we passed 12 years ago. The only thing this item provides for is to enable him to supplement their salaries with an allowance which he bases on the increased cost of living.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I assume that that is the real purpose of the appropriation.

Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is wrong in his belief that they are transferred for political reasons. The only appointments I have been able to get in the State Department was through Secretary Knox.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think there have been cases—but we barred all that when the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN] made his statement the other day and produced Mr. Lansing as his best witness—there have been cases where the department has found that the incumbent did not come up to

requirements, or for other reasons moved him from place to place.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I agree entirely with what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] has said as to the unwisdom, generally speaking, of lump-sum appropriations. Public moneys ought to be expended for public purposes, and the legislature which makes the appropriations ought to define specifically those purposes. When I first came to Congress lump-sum appropriations were much more common than is now the practice. Gradually Congress has been putting a stop to that sort of thing. I should have opposed in the committee the incorporation of this paragraph in the bill had it not been for the statement made by Assistant Secretary Carr in respect to the very exceptional circumstances which now confront the country and the whole civilized world. Possibly these circumstances justify this exception, but as I say, generally speaking, Congress should not permit the turning over of great sums of money from the Public Treasury to be expended in the discretion of any executive officer. It is opposed to the whole theory upon which moneys ought to be appropriated in a free country. One great authority has said that those who appropriate the money ought to believe, although it is not always true, that the trustee having charge of money to expend will expend some portion of it for his own advantage, and, therefore, if you make the law strict to prevent that, you do injustice to no executive officer.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STAFFORD) there were—ayes 21, noes 10.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

ALLOWANCE FOR CLERK HIRE AT UNITED STATES CONSULATES.

Allowance for clerk hire at consulates, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State, \$818,000.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill for an explanation of this extraordinary item. We have been condemning an appropriation of \$800,000 as a lump-sum appropriation, and here now comes an appropriation of \$818,000 as a lump-sum appropriation. The other was to be expended for the diplomatic officers of the Government, and this is to be expended for clerk hire. What is the use of fixing clerk hire if we are to permit the Secretary of State to expend \$818,000 in increasing that clerk hire?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, the number of clerks since the war began has enormously increased.

Mr. ROBBINS. This seems to be for just clerk hire; it does not mention additional clerks.

Mr. FLOOD. That is the whole item. It is for those we have now, and those we have taken in since the war began and those that we are going to take in.

Mr. ROBBINS. Did we not just increase the salaries of the clerks a while ago?

Mr. FLOOD. The clerks at embassies and legations.

Mr. ROBBINS. Is there any salary for clerks except what is fixed by the Secretary of State under this clause?

Mr. FLOOD. We have not fixed the salaries of clerks by law.

Mr. ROBBINS. Then this is an allowance that is made to each clerk, in the discretion of the Secretary of State, in addition to the allowance fixed by law for his compensation?

Mr. FLOOD. We have no other item for clerk hire at the consulate than this. This pays for all of the clerks at all of the consulates.

Mr. ROBBINS. And the amount that is paid is fixed by the Secretary of State?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. ROBBINS. Congress has not fixed it in any instance?

Mr. FLOOD. It never has.

Mr. ROBBINS. Does the chairman of the committee think that is a wise plan?

Mr. FLOOD. It has always been the custom. The number of clerks that you need at a consulate varies. Of course this is a larger appropriation than they have ever had before.

Mr. ROBBINS. How much does this exceed the last appropriation? I am advised that the last appropriation was only \$493,000. This is almost twice as much as last year. Why is the increase so great?

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman is correct about the amount carried in the appropriation bill last year being \$493,000, but the representative of the State Department went before the Committee on Appropriations and in one of the deficiency appropriation bills obtained \$325,000, and what the Foreign Affairs

Committee recommended and the Committee on Appropriations allowed is the amount that we have recommended in this bill.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBBINS. In just a moment. How many clerks are there in the service?

Mr. FLOOD. Nobody knows; they are constantly changing.

Mr. ROBBINS. Well, I would suppose there would be changes, but how many were there last year? The gentleman knows that.

Mr. FLOOD. I do not know; but of course we could find out from the State Department exactly how many there were. I just never undertook to do it.

Mr. ROBBINS. Can the chairman of the committee, who is familiar with this bill, tell us the salary that is paid, either the highest salary or the average salary paid to clerks last year?

Mr. FLOOD. They range from \$600 to \$2,000.

Mr. ROBBINS. Two thousand dollars would be the highest paid last year, and that was paid under an allowance made by the Secretary of State in his discretion out of the lump-sum appropriation?

Mr. FLOOD. And then the amount authorized by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROBBINS. How much?

Mr. FLOOD. Three hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars added to the amount, and that is carried in this bill this year.

Mr. ROBBINS. Then the \$493,000 in the last bill and the \$325,000 appropriated by the Committee on Appropriations you add together and make the appropriation in this bill?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. ROBBINS. What does the gentleman expect the Committee on Appropriations to do when it comes along to appropriate for this item?

Mr. FLOOD. We expect this to cover it all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROBBINS. I ask for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FLOOD. The expectation of the representatives of the State Department with whom we conferred was that this would cover the entire clerk hire.

Mr. ROBBINS. Can the gentleman assure the committee there will be nothing in the bill from the Committee on Appropriations to cover this item?

Mr. FLOOD. That is the supposition; of course it might be wrong. I can not assure the committee, as the gentleman suggested, because in these times no one can be certain of what the morrow will bring forth.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. ROBBINS. Certainly.

Mr. ROGERS. The report of the committee, on page 14, shows one very important reason for this great increase:

Since the advent of the United States into the war it has been the policy of the State Department in every way to Americanize the clerical force.

That, of course, almost always necessitates a considerable addition to the salary of the clerical force, because it costs more to get an American citizen here, send him over there, and maintain him than it does to secure a foreigner who is simply picked up in a city where he is to be stationed, and I think the gentleman will agree that that expenditure of money is an extremely wholesome one, especially when the United States is at war.

Mr. ROBBINS. I agree with the contention, because my observation abroad is that there are many foreigners employed in this branch of the service.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question. While we are on this subject of consulates can the gentleman say what consulates are now owned by the United States Government?

Mr. FLOOD. No; I do not think we own any.

Mr. ROBBINS. The gentleman from Ohio means houses?

Mr. LONGWORTH. There are a certain number—

Mr. FLOOD. In the Far East we own some.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I withdraw the pro forma amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Expenses of providing all such stationery, blanks, record and other books, seals, presses, flags, signs, rent (so much as may be necessary), repairs to consular buildings owned by the United States, postage, furniture, including typewriters and exchange of same, statistics, newspapers, freight (foreign and domestic), telegrams, advertising, messenger service, traveling expenses of consular officers and consular assistants, compensation of Chinese writers, loss by exchange, and such other miscellaneous expenses as the President may think necessary for the several consulates and consular agents in the transaction of their business, and payment in advance of subscriptions for newspapers (foreign and domestic) under this appropriation is hereby authorized, \$828,000.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee why this item is increased from \$625,000, as carried in last year's bill, to \$828,000 in this bill? What is the necessity for any such lump-sum increase at this time for items which are small in their amount? We only have one consular building or two, as has been just stated, in the Far East.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman sees a great many other important items contained in this—stationery and telegrams—

Mr. LONGWORTH. And rent.

Mr. FLOOD. And the telegraph service even with consulates has increased tremendously.

All of our business has to be carried on there by cable. The business is important, and the mails are not certain. We had an appropriation last year of \$625,000 and an emergency appropriation of \$28,000, and some other appropriations were added. The real increase is only about \$75,000. So the increase is not as much as it appears; but it is very considerable, and due largely to the tremendous cable service we have.

Mr. ROBBINS. That would be only \$653,000 last year. Now you increase it to \$828,000.

Mr. FLOOD. You will see that last year we were engaged in war, but this work is increasing all the time.

Mr. ROBBINS. I beg the gentleman's pardon. That appropriation would not be made in contemplation of war last year.

Mr. FLOOD. We were not in war all the time.

Mr. ROBBINS. The appropriation would not be made in contemplation of war, and the appropriation was only \$653,000 for the fiscal year.

Mr. FLOOD. We were in war the whole year.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit me to read a statement that was made in the hearings by Mr. Carr on this very point? It will answer completely the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ROBBINS. I will be very glad to have it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. He says:

Contingent expenses of United States consulates—this is an apparent increase, although in reality it is not an increase, except about \$75,000, and \$28,000 of that was carried in the war relief appropriation and was taken over in the deficiency bill last fall by special deficiency appropriation into this, and then we put in \$75,000 additional to allow for what we considered a normal increase, perhaps, in view of present conditions. Now I find I have left only about \$70,000 unallotted balance to carry us through the rest of this fiscal year, and I have very grave doubts as to whether it is going to do that or not. In fact, I am afraid it will not. It may be that upon further examination we may have to submit a recommendation for a still further enlargement of that fund. The conditions are so abnormal that accurate estimates are next to impossible. One can only look a week or so ahead nowadays. It may be that we will have to ask for more money there. Saturday evening, Mr. Long, Third Assistant Secretary, spoke to me about diplomatic clerk hire allowance and said we had suddenly found that we were without a cent for this item beyond that which has been allotted up to June 30, with constant demands coming in by telegraph for clerks; and he asked me to submit to the committee the advisability of providing for about 50 clerks for the rest of the year, or \$50,000. For clerk hire for the Diplomatic Service the estimate is \$200,000, plus transportation expenses, which I estimate at about \$20,000 for the rest of the fiscal year, or about \$40,000 for the next fiscal year.

Mr. ROBBINS. That explanation is very complete, and also explains another matter that I heard the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RAGSDALE] speak about yesterday, namely, his wanting an extra clerk. I wonder where he is going to get him if we get these? I do not see the gentleman in the House now, but I would like to know where he proposes to get his extra clerk. However, the explanation answers my question.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks made on the floor of the House yesterday. I am doing this at the request of one Member that a part should be eliminated.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

Mr. ROBBINS. Reserving the right to object, I will not object if he answers the question as to where he expects to put his extra clerk, in view of the crowded condition of the State Department now.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the erection at the city of San Salvador on ground presented by the Government of Salvador of a suitable building constructed of reinforced concrete for the use of the legation to Salvador, both as a residence of the minister and for the offices of the legation, and for the necessary furniture of the building, \$40,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary: *Provided*, That the President is hereby authorized to accept on behalf of the United States the plot of ground graciously presented by the Government of Salvador as the site for the erection of a legation building or buildings.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if estimates have been submitted by the Secretary of State to the Secretary of the Treasury as to the limit of cost on this building?

Mr. FLOOD. They recommended to Congress \$25,000.

Mr. WALSH. That is the recommendation set out in the report of the gentleman's committee, but I desire to know if the Secretary of State has submitted to the Secretary of the Treasury estimates as to the limit of cost for this building?

Mr. FLOOD. I suppose they did—the \$25,000.

Mr. WALSH. That fact does not appear in the report. I understand this building is designed to take the place of one which was destroyed by an earthquake in San Salvador in June of last year, and they have been occupying temporary quarters since that time. The report calls for an appropriation of \$25,000 for the erection of a building, whereas the amount in the item calls for \$40,000.

Mr. FLOOD. The Committee on Foreign Affairs decided to change the character of building recommended by the State Department from a frame building to a concrete building, and realizing that it would take more money, they made a larger appropriation.

Mr. WALSH. But there is no limit of cost fixed in this item in the bill, as is required by the statute. It says \$40,000, but does not limit the cost at all.

Mr. FLOOD. Oh, yes; it does. That is all it appropriates. It does not appropriate anything beyond that.

Mr. WALSH. They could start to erect an \$80,000 building under this item.

Mr. FLOOD. Oh, no.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, yes.

Mr. WALSH. I disagree with the gentleman, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman permit? Under this authorization, as there is no limit of cost, the work being initiated, it would enable on an appropriation bill further appropriations to any amount at all. Does not the gentleman believe it is advisable to place in here a limitation and limit the cost to not exceed a certain amount?

Mr. FLOOD. This is the way this character of item has been carried in other bills. We appropriated somewhat over \$600,000 for the buildings at Shanghai, and they got the buildings for a great deal less than the items.

Mr. STAFFORD. There the Government was negotiating for certain established buildings, and we got them for less than the amount authorized for their purchase.

Mr. FLOOD. Here was an appropriation for Berne and other places. The gentleman might be right ordinarily. It occurs to me that probably we would have to make an additional appropriation for this building, because, my opinion is, that \$40,000 will not build the character of a building we describe and furnish it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Of course \$60,000 would be necessary for a concrete building. I do not know why the committee recommended an appropriation of \$40,000, except as an initial appropriation.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER], who is familiar with buildings of that character in Central America, thought that \$40,000 would be sufficient.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman from Minnesota any objection to placing a limit of cost, say, at \$50,000?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. To be perfectly frank about this item, I want to say that no man on earth knows what it will cost to build a concrete building or even a wooden building at San Salvador under the conditions now existing. The proposal to build a wooden building presupposed that it should be constructed of California redwood, which has been found to be the only wood available that would not be destroyed by ants.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. It is practically impossible to get the California redwood, even in normal times, anywhere outside of this country, and it is a practical certainty that it could not be procured this year or next year or at any time within reasonable contemplation. I may add that it is very doubtful if California redwood would be absolutely immune from attack by the ants. Anyone knows that no kind of wood except that which is immune from the ants should be used; otherwise the wood would be honeycombed with the ants, and it would be only a question of time when the building constructed would fall as if it were made of sand.

I have a particular reason for asking for concrete, which I will explain in a moment. But before making that statement I desire to say that the statement that \$60,000 was estimated for the cost of this building is not accurate. It is as accurate as it could be made from the hearings we had, but the gentleman will find, if he reads the hearing attentively, that the minister to Salvador thought it would cost about \$60,000. At least somebody thought it might cost about \$60,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the decision of the committee as to the limit of cost on this embassy and legation building?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I will come to that in a moment, if the gentleman is a little more patient.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is always patient.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I think it can be built for \$40,000. It may be, though, that it might cost \$50,000. It will not probably cost \$60,000. I have observed the buildings constructed by this Government in all its tropical possessions, in Hawaii, in the Philippine Islands, and also in Panama, and if we have arrived at any result through all our experience in the Tropics it is that we should not put a dollar in any kind of a building that is not constructed of reinforced concrete.

For instance, a reinforced-concrete building is not subject to destruction by the ordinary earthquake. In the Philippine Islands there have been constructed school buildings and provincial buildings of reinforced concrete, and, by the way, they do not think of building any other kind of a structure there. Many of those buildings are within an area where they have a hundred, or even three hundred earthquake shocks in a year. None of them have been damaged. Nor can anyone cite an instance where a properly constructed building of reinforced concrete has been injured in an earthquake region.

Besides that, reinforced buildings are the most sanitary of any kind of building that can be erected in the Tropics. Third, it is the coolest kind of building that can be constructed in the Tropics; and, fourth, they will last, and they are the only kind of a building that will last there. I do not care what kind of a wooden structure you erect, there are two things that will soon knock it down. First, the ants will eat holes in it and it falls. In the early years of our occupation of the Philippines we used wood in the construction of school buildings, and those buildings are now in ruins, and are not in use, because it is dangerous to put people in them. The other thing that knocks them down is the hurricane or the typhoon, that works havoc everywhere throughout the Tropics.

So that every consideration of common sense and experience requires that if we build a building of any kind in the Tropics that building should be of reinforced concrete, which is fire-proof.

Mr. LONGWORTH. What is the value of the land that is given to us?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. That is problematical. The minister said that there was no exact method of determining the value, but he thought probably it was worth \$6,000 or \$7,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired. The gentleman from Massachusetts made a point of order.

Mr. FLOOD. It is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman from Massachusetts be given five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks that the gentleman from Massachusetts may have five minutes more, is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, with the permission of the gentleman from Massachusetts, I want to say that the minister said that this lot could be bought for about \$9,000, in American money.

Mr. WALSH. Including the ants.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Massachusetts will yield—

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I want to complete my statement. Under all these conditions the Government ought to build a permanent building, one that will be respectable and take care of all the business interests that we have at that point. It is proposed this building shall house the minister at San Salvador and also the consul general. In other words, the offices of both of these officials are to be inside the building.

Mr. WALSH. How numerous is the force of these officials?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. It is not large, if it was we could not possibly build a building for \$40,000 or three times that. I think \$40,000 or \$50,000 will be sufficient to build it. Why can not we estimate it accurately? Because it is impossible.

First, because nobody has been building that class of buildings there; and, second, there is no class of workmen there qualified to do that kind of work. This was the suggestion that influenced me to reach the idea of adopting reinforced concrete. We have on the Panama Zone the most expert concrete workers in the world. We have a force under the engineering department of the Army under the government on the zone that has the largest experience of any people in the world in building buildings out of reinforced concrete for the Tropics, and I do not except the enormous experience the Government has had in the Philippine Islands, where hundreds of buildings have been constructed of that character. It seemed to me that we could easily take a force of these men to draw the plans, go to the point, and construct the building out of material sent to that country. I do not think that there is any question in the world but what that can be done, and I do not think the expense would be over \$40,000, although it may be \$50,000 or \$55,000. I would not object to putting a limit of \$60,000 on it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think there should be a limit to the amount so that they could not run wild.

Mr. FLOOD. I have no objection to the limitation being put on. There never has been any question in regard to this. We have been making the appropriations for years in exactly the same language. The Shanghai building and the building at Berne were built last year, and the appropriation for the legation in Cuba was made in this language. In the authorization for the building at Costa Rica last year the same language was used. In these cases that was all that anyone in the Department of State or on the committee anticipated would be used. Some of us on the committee thought there would be more money used in this particular case appropriated for to-day on account of the lack of information as to the cost of reinforced concrete in San Salvador, but if the gentleman from Wisconsin desires to offer an amendment putting the limitation at \$60,000 I shall not object.

Mr. STAFFORD. There ought to be some limit.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, clearly what has been brought out in the discussion during the pendency of the point of order discloses that this item is subject to a point of order. The requirements of the statute are to the effect that a limitation must necessarily be placed in every appropriation which is made for these buildings; and, furthermore, that there shall be some estimates obtained and submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury to the Secretary of State prior to the appropriation being asked for. That has not been done in this case, and in these times, when we are having such great difficulty in housing and providing accommodations for those who work not only here in Washington in the various departments but in getting accommodations for those who work in the shipyards and other industrial activities in connection with this great war, it seems to me the matter of building a concrete residence or mansion for the location of our representative at San Salvador might well be deferred, and although the amount to be saved is small, yet it is worth while to save it. I understand that the gentleman from Wisconsin proposes to insert some language if the point of order is withdrawn limiting the appropriation.

Mr. FLOOD. What is the point of order?

Mr. WALSH. The point of order is, first, that it is new legislation, and, second, that it being new legislation it is not in accordance with the requirements of existing law.

The mere fact that other items in other measures have been enacted in appropriation bills heretofore, not in conformity with existing law, certainly is no justification for the enactment of this legislation in this form. However, if the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] is acceptable to the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. FLOOD], I am willing to withdraw the reservation of the point of order. I understand the chairman is agreeable.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman will not make the point of order that the item is not authorized by law?

Mr. WALSH. And not in accordance with the requirements of existing law.

Mr. FLOOD. Do you make the other point?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I understood that the gentleman would not make the point of order if we accept the proposed limitation of \$60,000.

Mr. WALSH. If the limitation is incorporated in the bill, I am willing to waive the other point.

Mr. FLOOD. That is all right; but it is authorized by law.

Mr. WALSH. It is not authorized by law in this manner.

Mr. FLOOD. The appropriation is authorized by law.

Mr. WALSH. Of course the appropriation is authorized by law in a certain way and after certain things are done; but until those things are done there is no authorization for making the appropriation.

Mr. FLOOD. Now, will the gentleman from Wisconsin offer his amendment?

Mr. WALSH. I will withdraw the reservation of the point of order on the assurance of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs that the proposition to insert the limitation is acceptable to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws the point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, after the word "building," in line 22, page 26, to insert the words "at a limit of cost not to exceed \$60,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAFFORD: Page 26, line 22, after the word "building," insert the following: "at a limit of cost not to exceed \$60,000."

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I am glad to yield to my generous friend.

Mr. WALSH. I notice you increase this amount some \$20,000. I want to ask if the purpose of that increase is to destroy some of those rapacious ants that they have down there in that country?

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not acquainted with the ant population. I will yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, who is very alert, to go down there and see how many there are to be killed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBBINS. Is it not necessary to change the amount of \$40,000, on page 27, to conform to the amendment which has just been inserted on motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. FLOOD. No. This is the appropriation for this year. The other is the limitation on the total amount.

Mr. STAFFORD. The \$40,000 is the amount that is available at the present time.

Mr. ROBBINS. The other is for the building?

Mr. STAFFORD. No; we appropriate \$40,000 at the present time for this building and furniture. Later they may call upon us for subsequent appropriations, but under the existing authorization they can not ask for more than \$60,000 in all. That is the purpose of the limitation usually carried in public building appropriation bills.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the amendments and with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HUMPHREYS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9314) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. RODENBERG, for 10 days, on account of important business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday last the gentleman from Missouri, Judge ALEXANDER, by unanimous consent was granted leave to call up as a privileged matter the bill S. 3389, relating to housing facilities, after the passage of the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill. Monday next is District day under the rule. I therefore ask unanimous consent that after the disposal of Judge ALEXANDER's bill a day be given for the consideration of District business.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the consideration of the bill S. 3389, which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] has made privileged, a day shall be given to the consideration of District business. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The next day after the disposal of that bill.

The SPEAKER. The next day after the disposal of that bill, not to interfere with Calendar Wednesday or privileged matters. Is there objection?

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the gentleman from Kentucky tell us what legislation will be brought up at that time? Will it be the bill reported by the committee to fix the rents in the District of Columbia?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The bill undertaking to stop profiteering in rents in the District of Columbia is the one that I propose to call up.

Mr. MAPES. That is the only one?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. That is the only one.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.), in accordance with the order heretofore made, the House adjourned until to-morrow, Sunday, February 10, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting list of cases dismissed by the court December 10, 1917 (H. Doc. No. 924); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting, in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of the river and harbor act, a list of claims for damages which have been adjusted and settled by the Chief of Engineers and approved by the Secretary of War (H. Doc. No. 925); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimates of appropriations for marine hospitals and marine stations (H. Doc. No. 926); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. SIMS, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 1854) to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 293), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9685) to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 294), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DENT, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9100) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant furloughs without pay and allowances to enlisted men of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 295), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9163) to provide for reimbursement of actual expenses or flat per diem for enlisted men traveling on duty under competent orders, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 296), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9098) to suspend for the period of the present emergency sections 45, 46, and 56 of "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 297), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8409) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize condemnation proceedings of lands for military purposes," ap-

proved July 2, 1917, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 298), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9571) to authorize the appointment of officers of the Philippine Scouts as officers in the militia or other locally created armed forces of the Philippine Islands drafted into the service of the United States, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 299), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9712) to prevent and punish the sale of Army and Navy uniforms to persons not authorized to wear them; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Washington: A bill (H. R. 9713) granting pensions to honorably discharged soldiers and sailors in the military or naval forces of the United States during the Civil War, fixing the amount of the same, and making classifications thereof; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 9714) for the purpose of limiting the activities of certain officers and employees of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 9715) extending the time for the construction of a bridge across the Bayou Bartholomew, in Ashley County, Wilmot Township, State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MCKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 9716) to authorize the Secretary of War to lease and sublet land within military reservation camps, cantonment and aviation fields, and proving grounds for agricultural and other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 9717) to create a commission on illiteracy to be known as the American Illiteracy Commission; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. EMERSON: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 239) to waive certain requirements for citizenship from soldiers and sailors during the present war; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BARNHART: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 240) to provide further for the national security and defense by securing to the Government of the United States an adequate supply of print paper at a fair price and by insuring a supply and equitable distribution at fair prices to the industries of the United States; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 9718) granting an increase of pension to Hiram J. Pitsenbarger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9719) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Edmiston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 9720) granting an increase of pension to John M. Willoughby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 9721) granting an increase of pension to Joseph L. Middleton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 9722) granting a pension to Virginia Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 9723) granting an increase of pension to Morris Springfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9724) granting an increase of pension to Henry D. Combs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 9725) granting an increase of pension to Ruth McClay; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 9726) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Meskimen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 9727) granting a pension to James P. Curtis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MCKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 9728) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Jackson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 9729) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Lucas Lapine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9730) granting a pension to Lena McLain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 9731) granting an increase of pension to John Right; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9732) granting an increase of pension to Stinnett Bee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9733) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Roper; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9734) granting a pension to Ella V. Altmeier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9735) granting a pension to Bertha Margaret Watkins, Helen L. Watkins, James O. Watkins, and Dortha G. Watkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9736) granting six months' pay to Fanny Appleby, mother of Robert W. Appleby, deceased, who served in Headquarters Company, Eighth Infantry, Ohio National Guard, border defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POLK: A bill (H. R. 9737) granting an increase of pension to John W. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9738) granting a pension to Dallas Mills; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 9739) granting a pension to Thomas A. Starrh; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9740) granting a pension to Nels Christensen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 9741) granting a pension to Isaac Holley, alias Isaac Holey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9742) granting a pension to Eva M. Bevier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 9743) granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Langdon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEVENSON: A bill (H. R. 9744) granting an increase of pension to Henry Langly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 9745) granting an increase of pension to Eli Abbott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 9746) granting a pension to Maria Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Civil Liberties Bureau, asking for a congressional investigation of wartime violations of constitutional right, mob violence, censorship, and the efforts to use the war to crush labor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), resolution of the Corning (N. Y.) Clionian Circle, against the zone system for postage on periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), resolutions from the Ladies' Auxiliary of the Presbyterian Church, Cloquet, Minn.; Current Events Club, Madison, Ind.; Penelopian Club, Cadillac, Mich.; and the Business Men's League, Hot Springs, Ark., asking for the repeal of the periodical amendment to the war-revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), resolution of the Cleveland Tractor Co., objecting to the increased rates of postage on periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAREW: Resolution of the Woman's Missionary Society of the United Presbyterian Church, Fort Morgan, Colo., asking for the repeal of the second-class postage provisions of the war-revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of the Cleveland Tractor Co., and resolutions of Romeo Monday Club, Romeo, Mich.; Business Men's League, Hot Springs, Ark.; Current Events Club, Madison, Ind.; the Ladies' Auxiliary of the Presbyterian Church, Cloquet, Minn.; Corning (N. Y.) Clionian Circle; and the Maryville (Mo.) Commercial Club, objecting to the second-class postage provisions of the war-revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania: Petition of M. Griswold, Jr.; H. A. Nye; J. W. Burnett; and 20 others, praying for the passage of House bill 7995, for the preservation of the Niagara, Commodore Perry's flagship in the Battle of Lake Erie; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Letter from the Cleveland Tractor Co., and resolutions from the following organizations: The Ladies' Auxiliary of the Presbyterian Church, Cloquet, Minn.; Penelopian Club, Cadillac, Mich.; the Woman's Missionary Society of the United Presbyterian Church, Fort Morgan, Colo.; Business Men's League, Hot Springs, Ark.; Current Events Club, Madison, Ind.; Maryville Commercial Club, Maryville, Mo.; the

Sorosis Club, St. Peter, Minn.; Corning (N. Y.) Clionian Club; and the Romeo Monday Club, Romeo, Mich., all asking for the repeal of the second-class postage rates of the war-revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, asking for the survey of the Delaware & Hudson and other abandoned canals, with a view to their use in transportation of coal; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of William H. Walker & Co., Buffalo, N. Y., in favor of the immediate passage of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Lewis S. Pilcher, M. D., asking favorable consideration of House bill 9563; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the rural mail carriers of Black River Falls, Wis., praying for an allowance covering necessary upkeep expenses; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Cleveland Tractor Co., objecting to the increased postage rates for second-class matter in the war-revenue act; also resolutions of the same import from the Ladies' Auxiliary of the Presbyterian Church, Cloquet, Minn.; Penelopian Club, Cadillac, Mich.; Business Men's League, Hot Springs, Ark.; the Woman's Missionary Society of the United Presbyterian Church, Fort Morgan, Colo.; and the Corning (N. Y.) Clionian Circle; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of the Cleveland Tractor Co., and resolutions of the Penelopian Club, Cadillac, Mich.; the Ladies' Auxiliary of the Presbyterian Church, Cloquet, Minn.; Current Events Club, Madison, Ind.; the Sorosis Club, St. Peter, Minn.; the Woman's Missionary Society of the United Presbyterian Church, Fort Morgan, Colo.; Corning (N. Y.) Clionian Circle; and the Business Men's League, Hot Springs, Ark., objecting to the second-class postal provisions of the war-revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Papers to accompany House bill 2094, a bill to pension John M. Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: Memorial of Romeo Monday Club, of Romeo, Mich., protesting against proposed postal increase on periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Petition of Pittsburgh Methodist Episcopal ministers, favoring immediate war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAGUE: Petitions of Ladies' Auxiliary of the Presbyterian Church, Cloquet, Mich.; Penelopian Club, Cadillac, Mich.; Cleveland Tractor Co., Cleveland, Ohio; Corning Clionian Circle, Corning, N. Y.; Maryville Commercial Club, Maryville, Mo.; Sorosis Club, St. Peter, Minn.; Current Events Club, Madison, Ind.; Business Men's League, Hot Springs, Ark.; and Romeo Monday Club, Romeo, Mich., objecting to the increased rates of postage on periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Bohemian National Alliance, New York City, commending the President's war aims; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Woman's Missionary Society, Fort Morgan, Colo., and New England Association of Circulation Managers of New Bedford, Mass., opposing increased rates of postage on periodicals; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SUNDAY, February 10, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by Mr. SHERWOOD as Speaker pro tempore.

Rev. George Robinson, United States Army, retired, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, we recognize Thee as the author of life, the arbiter of our destiny. We thank Thee that Thou hast given life to men, that Thou art the former of our bodies, so fearfully and wonderfully made, and the Father of the spirits of all men. We thank Thee, too, that in these spirits of ours everywhere Thou hast implanted a longing for and a belief in a life beyond this life.

We thank Thee, O Lord Jesus Christ, who came from Heaven to give life and to give it more abundantly, that Thou didst confirm this hope and belief in the hearts of men, that Thou didst teach that Thou art the source of life, that Thou didst prove by Thy resurrection from the dead, and by infallible proofs to Thy disciples that Thou hadst risen, that this life was in Thee. This gives us hope in the death of those whom we love; and we pray Thee that on this occasion Thou wilt confirm this hope and this belief to each and every one of us. Do